

THE  
HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE SEE OF ROME TO A. D. 1758.

BY

ARCHIBALD BOWER, ESQ.

FORMERLY PUBLIC PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC, HISTORY, AND PHILOSOPHY, IN THE UNIVERSITIES  
OF ROME, FERMO, AND MACERATA, AND IN THE LATTER PLACE  
COUNSELLOR OF THE INQUISITION.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION,

AND

A CONTINUATION TO THE PRESENT TIME:

BY

REV. SAMUEL HANSON COX, D.D.,

PROFESSOR EXTRAORDINARY OF BIBLICAL AND CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN THE UNION  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

---

---

PHILADELPHIA:

GRIFFITH & SIMON, 188 NORTH THIRD STREET.

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON.

1844.

# HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE

THE HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE

OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

---

ENTERED according to act of Congress, in the year 1844, by

GRIFFITH & SIMON,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

---

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON, PHILADELPHIA.

PRINTED BY KING & BAIRD.

---



# INTRODUCTION,

BY

THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

---

AN edition from the American press, of BOWER'S HISTORY OF THE POPES, has been long a desideratum with scholars, and may now be welcomed with pleasure by our Protestant and Christian community. It is a valuable thesaurus of facts, dates, and periods, historically arranged, and well digested, authentic and readable, and so a most important accession to our religious literature. It is an interesting and credible history, with themes, topics, and general scope, adapted to the times, seasonable, and capable of appreciation by American Christians. We believe also that it will be eminently useful; that its mission will be favorable to all our social and literary, our civil and religious interests; and that while its whole influence will be congenial with appropriate and genuine American sentiment, its contents are so coincident in effect with the sacred volumes of our common Christianity, as to anticipate for its publication the blessing of heaven. It will serve the place, in every library and in every family, of a great Historical and Biographical Dictionary, for reference and consultation on particular topics or related questions that occur; and yet it will be such a rich, well digested, and systematized historical work, in chronological order and continuity displayed, as to deserve and reward the more mature attention of the professional student. Its reading, too, will be found of that species which is adapted to interest the young, and to form—what ought to be regarded as a most desirable trait of character—a love of historical truth, a pursuit of its very

noble science, and a wisdom in practice founded on its indisputable and instructive facts. Indeed, any common citizen might well be arrested, and retained consecutively, in the perusal of the work of Bower to the end, without being accused of singularity—as one, of whom we have heard, and there could be no more than one, who was thought a monomaniac, because he had actually read through, in course, the whole of Webster's quarto Dictionary in two volumes, prolegomena and all!

Our author was a North Briton; born near Dundee in Scotland, January 17, 1685. Of his parentage little is known. He was educated at Douay in France, that school and fountain of Romanism and Jesuitism, whence so many streams have flowed for the contamination of the world! Thence he passed to Rome, about 1700, and became a Jesuit. In the very metropolis of THE MAN OF SIN, he seems to have prized his opportunity of professional improvement, with all the sincerity of a bigot and all the heathenizing devotion of a formalist. Here he enjoyed great advantages, of which he sedulously availed himself; for knowing the system and practices of the popedom; for studying the character and operations of the hierarchy; for consulting the best historical documents, and amassing stores of patristical learning; and for seeing, and knowing, and fathoming, the debauched politics of the court of Rome. In this occupation he was so absorbed, so romanized in his Latin researches, and so italianized in his daily converse, that he forgot his own

iii



vernacular; and when about forty years of age, could scarcely express himself intelligibly in English. It was at this time probably that his doubts about the apostolicity of the succession of the pseudo chair of St. Peter began. He had to swallow such and so many dogmas, pious frauds, and quasi facts, indigestible and monstrous, that his long obsolete common sense and revived moral consciousness began together to relucate against their doses—and to void them. He soon found means of escape from such intolerable task-masters, fled to England in 1726, and there embraced the faith of Protestants. His great learning, his Italian training, his familiarity with things, commended him to the great; and it was his good fortune to become acquainted with Lord Aylmer, to whose favor he was indebted, and in whose family he passed several years. Here he gradually reclaimed his English, which when he sufficiently understood, he commenced author, by beginning to labor for the booksellers, in the publication of the *Historia Literaria*; which however he abandoned in 1734, for a large share in the composition of the *Universal History*.

His principles were thought by some to be unsteady and insincere, who never doubted, however, his great learning. That they were unestablished is certain; nor is it wonderful to those who consider his education and his deep potations of that worse than circean *cup* of intoxication, with which the mighty Sorceress of nations, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH, has drugged for ages the whole population of the occident. Hence in 1745 the wily influence of the Jesuits prevailed, and he was re-victimized to their inventions. But this miserable relapse was of short continuance. In 1747 he became himself again, re-renounced their errors and their communion, and continued to the end of life a Protestant; having published his dissent from those within whose dark precincts he had so lately sought protection as a penitent. He now commenced his *History of the Popes* from his very ample materials and resources, and made it the work of his

life. He married in 1740, and died Sep. 2, 1766, aged 80, his wife attesting that he died a Protestant. With his quarrels with the Jesuits, and the consequent troubles he experienced in other relations, we have little concern. Some impeach his sincerity, others his piety, none his learning. We view him as the fitting instrument of Providence for a great and peculiar work, in circumstances distinguished and rare, and for ends of great utility to the church. It is not wonderful if his own personal history should be the occasion of many diverse opinions or antipathies.

With fame in just proportion envy grows,  
And he who makes a character, makes—foes.

He certainly shows some points of great decision, and even of heroic and victorious principle. He seems in his great work to be sincere, and consistent, and scrupulously honest, from beginning to end. His own Introduction, and the concluding paragraph of his last volume, seem to necessitate, while they claim, our confidence in his integrity. As to all his sentiments, his reasonings, his philosophy, in his frequent descants on the themes of his work, we leave the ingenuous reader to his own calm inferences concerning them; while it is mainly in respect to their premises, the facts themselves, that we invite attention and confidence. His work is excellent and peculiar; it is a standard of its kind; it is like no other, and for practical use and reference it has no equal. The Popes appear there in numerical order, from the blessed but dishonored apostle Peter, down to Benedict XIV whose number is 245; making, with those additional, 252, to the present reigning Pope Gregory XVI inclusive. Clement XIII died 1769, and was on the throne of usurpations at the time of our author's publication and decease.

We have here the birth, origin, and personal character of the Popes, as well as their behavior and acts in the Sovereign pontificate; enabling us to know something about each of them, and detailing generally as much as any one wishes to read, about such unlovable monsters; though our author is just to them, discriminating, and sufficiently benign. Contemporaneous events and



persons are well introduced, and the facts of general history are skilfully interwoven. In the times of schism and anti-popes, and also in the sequence and the names of the first popes in the series, since authors and catalogues differ, and the oracles of Infallibility are not particularly invoked, we may take the numeration of our author, with its inclusions and its exclusions, perhaps as safely and as wisely as any other written or human authority. There is, however, quite an ambiguity sometimes in the facts themselves, or rather in persons; as, for example, when two, three, or four, pretenders were all reigning at once; each denouncing and anathematizing his rivals, and the whole world all but distracted to find—just then and just there—the veritable and legitimate succession in the case. This lineage is a tangled skein and a great puzzle, to all the heathenizing simpletons who believe in it. It is with some of them almost the first and the last article in their creed—because no such thing is given or implicated in Holy Writ! They seem to believe the more, where there is the less evidence; and especially if the thing be impossible or plainly false. Thus the strength of their faith seems generously to compensate the poverty of their proof, on the pious principle of *giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked*. We however have not so learned Christ; from whom we prefer to follow only in the light, to believe only in accordance with evidence, and to *try the spirits whether they are of God, because MANY FALSE PROPHETS are gone out into the world*. “Truth is more wonderful than fiction;” and historic truth, accurately comprehended, is necessary to the statesman, professional to the divine, important to the scholar, and valuable in a thousand ways to its possessor in every relation of life. It is manly and noble as an acquisition. Its illustrations and examples are excellent, where skilfully used by the orator: the light they shed on human character, on the laws of providence, and the moral-mediatorial government of God, is eminently profitable and salutary. The preacher should be familiar with them, and make them tributary to the themes

of heaven. And the poet, if he would have truth for his inspiration, ought to sing of realities which are, which have been, and which will be; that thus he may claim a substantial immortality in this and the future world, haloed in celestial honor and wreathed with eternal amaranth.

But such themes of history as the Popes of Rome are paragons of wonder, with no parallel in the universe. Their like never was and never will be. *Simillimi sibi omnes*; they are all like themselves alone. They are the greatest usurpers, the most unprincipled despots, the most cunning politicians, the most sublime impostors, the most consummate hypocrites, often the worst infidels, and, with some shadows and degrees of exception, the worst human beings, as a class, whose horrible system of wickedness, called in scripture THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY, produced through many centuries, ever scourged and cursed this world of apostacy, delusion, and sin.

*And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration.* Thus in the apocalypse, was the beloved John overwhelmed with consternation, when, in the progress of the visions of God, the Church of Rome, with sanctity and sin commingled—and the latter only genuine—was symbolized in this way to his view. The angel explains it to him, and plainly identifies that miserable harlot, when he says, *And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth [present tense] over the kings of the earth*. There was only one city in his day so reigning, and only one known to history that answers the description. The Church of Rome, with her pyramid of hierarchy, and a monarch Pope radiating on its summit, answers it completely. For one, the writer has no more doubt of the meaning of scripture, in its prophetic outline, as exemplified so fully in Daniel, Paul, and John, touching the Roman Antichrist, than in their testimony about the resurrection of the dead, the immortality of the soul, or the messianic character of Jesus of Nazareth. It is monstrous ignorance, or



rabid prejudice, or awful judicial blindness, or stupid and false charity, that veils it from the vision of thousands and millions in Christendom. And hence many nominal Protestants are not half Protestants—nor half Christians, as the consequence. They have a wonderfully elastic “charity,” which ignorantly includes among its objects especially all manner of sin, and error, and absurdity, and falsehood. Just as if the genuine charity of the New Testament was a silly, indiscriminate, or alterable affection; as if it had no eyes, and did not REJOICE IN THE TRUTH. Such persons have ordinarily no charity for God; hence to contradict him, or, as he resents it, to *make him a liar*, is a very easy affair and a cheap reckoning to their consciences. The time is come when enlightened and Christian Protestants and patriots in this country, must not only *hold the truth*, but *hold it fast*. Now the positions of a true Protestant are mainly the following—

1. The Holy Scriptures are the supreme rule of faith and practice, intelligible and true, and with no equal or proper rival in the world.

2. The Scriptures are given to all mankind, *and, by the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith*. A *regium donum* from the King of heaven to all the people on his footstool.

3. Every man has the right, as well as the duty, on his own accountability to God, to exercise his private judgment, to know the truth, and learn those oracles, *which are able to make us wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus*.

4. The ministry of the gospel is of no use, but, on the contrary, is a huge usurpation, and an intolerable nuisance, except as it is both totally subordinate, and totally subservient, to the genuine influence of *the glorious gospel of the blessed God*, according to the Holy Scriptures, on the minds and the manners of men in the world.

5. The Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ, nor any longer a church of Christ; having retrograded and apostatized from his ways, and now, instead of being and continuing *the*

*Bride, the Lamb's wife*, she has become, in her corruptions, in her idolatries, in her blasphemies, and in her persecutions, a repudiated harlot, nay, by way of eminence, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. As such, Jesus Christ has solemnly and unequivocally excommunicated her, in his own holy word. This he has done himself; by his holy apostles and prophets. And hence—exceptions of individuals possibly apart—he knows how many and who, they are the Church of Christ no more, but only the Church of Rome and the Synagogue of Satan.

There are some semi-Protestants, that are not half Protestants; and they cannot distinguish between the meretricious monster of Revelation, and the chaste spouse of the Son of God! though both of them are there described in awful juxtaposition and even frightful contrast, set in opposition, and with all the symbols and the picturesque delineations of contrariety, and antipathy, and dissimilitude. The angel had shown to the apostle at large and in varying phases, the awful megatherium of the Romish establishment, when, at last, chapter twenty-first, verse ninth, he says, *Come hither, I will show thee the Bride, the Lamb's wife*. And where was the scene of the vision? Was it Rome? Was it the city of seven hills? No! indeed. The scene changes to a great distance. *And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain*, and there was the vision realized, there was the Bride of Christ.

Hence God has ordered all his pious people to retreat from the confines of Rome. *And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, COME OUT OF HER, MY PEOPLE, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities*. Hence the divine vindication of the noble army of the Reformers! It was no schism that they made; it was only REFORMATION. And next to Christianity itself, it was one of the greatest blessings from God ever realized to man. Away with that superficial and smattering philosophy, becoming fashionable lately among a certain class



of ultra fanatical conservatives, the cringing exquisites and ostentatious dandies of literature, which affects to impeach or doubt the principles of our glorious Reformation. They are the real, though disguised, enemies of liberty in church and state—and we are almost tempted, when we witness their incorrigibleness, and their inconsistency, and their ingratitude, to hand them over to the inquisition for a day or two, that the venerable and sublime conservative fathers of the inquisitorial commission may teach them subjectively a thing or two, which will REFORM their transcendentalism, and bring them to their senses. They might then become better citizens, possibly, better Christians, and so better Protestants, as well as better philosophers.

It is a part of Rome's policy to deal in mystery, and mummery, and pageantry, and be sublimated away from all comprehension of the multitude. Hence there are clouds and darkness superinduced. A halo of lugubrious night envelops the ROMAN ANOMOS in his serene orgies of devotional abominations. The Pope is the great master of religious masquerade; and while *the world* is not yet done *wondering after the Beast*, what a piece of service to mankind and to God himself—just to lift the great veil of all disguises, and show things and sinners behind it, considerably as they are! Our author approximates this consummation. He enables us to go with him, where he has often been, behind the scenes; and into the green-room, and the black-room, and the fire-room, and the grand vestibule of pandemonium—and see facts, with calm fidelity in the light of truth. Reader, do you like the truth? or is your appetite too delicate, too refined, too exquisite, for any thing but rainbows and sun-sets and luxuries of fancy? If so, possibly you are neither a Protestant, nor a Christian, nor a patriot, nor an American, nor a friend of your species, nor a scholar in history, nor a man of sense! Well for you, that others think.

There is one objection, which deserves an answer here. It is frequently a difficulty to the uninformed and wavering, and very commonly a specious

cavil in the argumentation or the surmises of infidels. The hardened apostate, who wrote that fine history, the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, as well as his colleague and counterpart, Hume,\* often insinuates it, and makes it as plausible and taking, as if there were any solidity or truth in it. It is in substance this: The abuses of Christianity were many, and mighty, and monstrous, without any parallel in history. They began soon after the death of its author. They had progression and amplification, till literally they occupied by usurpation the throne of the Cæsars, and on the top of the pyramid of domination, claimed, and almost realized, the subjugation of the universe. Did this system come from heaven? Is its author God Almighty? What! Would he allow himself to be so superseded, misrepresented, dethroned? Incredible! Therefore Christianity is—all a *cunningly devised fable!* and we are the philosophers of the school of Porphyry and Tom Paine, who have discovered it.

To this we reply the more particularly, as our publication will disclose facts and scenes sufficient to suggest, or seemingly to confirm the objection, possibly, in the minds of some readers.

1. It is admitted, in the very terms of the objection, that they are all abuses of Christianity, and not Christianity itself. The objection then proceeds on the principle, that unless a religion be so

---

\*It is the policy of Hume, especially in his *History of England*, to magnify—and that is needless—the abuses of religion by the clergy, to elicit for them the indignation of his reader, and then ingeniously to confound them with religion itself, and so to procure the abhorrence of the reader, before he knows it, not to the abuses, as such, but to religion itself! Thus he insidiously makes an infidel, in a way as hypocritical as any thing he records, and as injurious to religion as any of the abuses he portrays. Thus his reader comes to feel, and then to say, that Christianity has done more evil than good in the world, and that Christianity is a corrupt system and cannot be of God! Thus has he done more hurt by his *History* than by his *Philosophical Essays*—since these are read by comparatively few, and often not comprehended when read. But in the other, the poison is more deleterious, because unsuspected and comparatively unexposed; while its principle is silly, unjust, false, and worthy only of the perverted conscience of an infidel.



good that it is incapable of being abused in this world of infidels and hypocrites, it cannot be true. This is the fundamental logic of the objection, an *experimentum crucis* with them. It is the same as to say that the ten commandments are not good, or not from God, because men break them; and that no law is divine unless men keep it. A fine criterion, truly; and splendid philosophers are they whose candor and love of truth prompt them to entertain the objection.

2. Christianity has a native tendency, an adaptation, and a perfect scope, to produce effects of goodness, and to emit influences of salvation, on the minds of men. Now, we inquire, Are these abuses the proper fruit of Christianity, or do they come by impious perversion only? and are they the abominations which it denounces and abhors more, infinitely more, than any other system which the world ever saw? If the latter, then blame the sun for the mists and exhalations, that, rising from the marshes and fens of the earth, breed pestilence and shroud the face of heaven, shutting out his light; or criminate and break your perfect mirror, for the sin of showing you the impurities on your face that need cleansing away: do these things first and forever—before you blame Christianity or doubt its truth, because wicked men pervert, abuse, and violate its glorious tendency and nature, in order to their own gratification in sin.

Religion is not sin; nor does religion, by which we mean Christianity, in any wise encourage, or patronize, or approve sin. Religion is therefore irresponsible, and that gloriously, for all those abuses, and perversions, and hypocrisies, however organized, or practised on system, or wide-reaching in their influence, or long-lasting in their devastation, or conspicuous and central and audacious in their enactment, which have ever disgraced the nominal worshippers of God, since Cain or Satan began them in the world. Religion not only has a tendency, but its tendency is incomparably mighty, and to good alone. Its tendency, resulting from the very nature and the wonderful adaptation of Chris-

tianity, is to enlighten and purify, to refine, expand, and elevate, to reform and bless and save mankind. In all the relations and spheres and interests of human life, it has this tendency—and it has no other tendency—it alone has this tendency—and it has this tendency so powerful, and with such moral omnipotence of God in it, that it is therefore well entitled in his own word, *the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek*. And even where it becomes in effect *the savor of death unto death*, making blind eyes blinder and hard hearts harder, until the wicked are ripe and *fitted to destruction*; we inquire, How comes it to pass? Is it not by resisting, or neglecting, or perverting its tendency, and in no other way? If not, is it by coinciding with the gospel—by meeting cordially its genuine influences, and by concurring with them? Is it by obeying the gospel, believing it, and acting in accordance with it? Is perdition, and its antecedent obduracy, the genuine fruit of the system of salvation? Or, is it only by counteraction, by hostility, by perversion, by abusing the gospel, and by such impious abuse alone, that, in such circumstances, the result of damnation is realized to its proper heirs!

3. The truth of Christianity, however, can both survive this objection, and overrule it for her own greater establishment and triumph.

Let these sceptical and cavilling philosophers remember that all these abuses were foreseen of God from all eternity, not only, but predicted copiously, graphically, and consecutively, through different and distant centuries of time; that they were fore-doomed, as abuses, abhorred of God, but never taking him by surprise; and that, therefore, their actual development or occurrence, as proved so amply in the very histories written by these philosophers, while it grieves the heart of the Christian, yet it edifies his faith, and is itself not a reason of doubt, but of confidence, as a necessary demonstration, in fact, of the truth of Christianity. These philosophers, so profound, seem to have discovered that the exact fulfilment of prophecy is a



demonstration of its falsity, and not of its truth! Whence we infer, that, if no such abuses had ever occurred, the system would have been abundantly more credible, which, in this sense, requires them to occur! Hence Providence fulfilling prophecy before our eyes, is no proof that prophecy is true! How sagacious are these philosophers, who never knew that *the foolishness of God is wiser than men!* The fact is, all these abuses were requisite in order to vindicate the truth of our divine system. We repeat it, that, while it tries our feelings and grieves our heart, it demonstrates the divine truth of Christianity, and so establishes our cordial confidence, *that our faith and hope might be in God.* We regard the cavil or the innuendo, therefore, as vastly contemptible; and worthy not of the talents or the attainments of these philosophers, but only of their cause, their master, and their reward!

Nor can there be any rational doubt as to the relation of the prophecy and the history, as mutually the counterparts of each other. Compare, for example, Dan. 7: 7. 8. 19—27, with II Thes. 2: 1—12, I Tim. 4: 1—5, and almost the whole of Revelation after the fifth chapter. They contain a series of prophetic announcements, extending through more than six hundred years, and which have now been fulfilling for a period of more than twenty-four hundred years—since Daniel wrote. They all refer to the same mystical personage, *the man of sin, the son of perdition, that wicked one.* They are all pictures and portraits, and good likenesses. We can easily identify the original—by the help especially of Hume and Gibbon, with their excellent histories. The correspondence is curious and wonderful. It contains rational evidence, to which Newton, and Locke, and Boyle, and Bacon, and Barrow, and Paley, and Edwards, and Dwight, and Washington, and a thousand others, bowed their full assent—while these rare philosophers skepticise, as above illustrated, in their serene vanity and madness.

There is another sentiment or principle not more definitive of the enlightened Protestant, than consolatory to the hum-

ble Christian and encouraging to the church of God—It is, THE CERTAIN, THE SPEEDY, AND THE FINAL DOWNFALL OF ROME.

Rome shall perish! Write that word  
In the blood that she has spilt;  
Perish hopeless and abhorred,  
Deep in ruin as in guilt.

The eighteenth chapter of Revelation is a solemn prophetic dirge, with all heaven's ovation, over her hastening and irremediable ruin. THE MAN OF SIN, says the blessed apostle Paul, is also THE SON OF PERDITION, and THAT WICKED—*whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.* And says Daniel, that lucid Prince of the Prophets, *I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame—the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.* AND THE KINGDOM AND DOMINION, AND THE GREATNESS OF THE KINGDOM UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, SHALL BE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH, WHOSE KINGDOM IS AN EVERLASTING KINGDOM, AND ALL DOMINIONS [or rulers on the earth] SHALL SERVE AND OBEY HIM.

These are only a few specimens of what the Word of God contains throughout, relative to the destined end of these tremendous and far-reaching abominations. For that end we ought sincerely to pray, that it may be hastened in its time. Nay, we hold it impossible to pray, *Thy kingdom come*, in faith and sincerity, without praying for the destruction of POPERY—and PUSEYISM, her own sister, now no longer veiled. They are both morally one, belonging to the *genus Romanum et Paganum*, and not to the *genus Christianum et divinum*. They are both inimical to *the truth as it is in Jesus*. They preach *another gospel, which is not ANOTHER*. And we know whose word is plighted for it, that—*Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.*

As to the time when Romanism shall perish, and the papacy be forever exploded by the promised judgments of



God, we pretend not to know with chronological certainty. Future events are predicted so in outline, as to give a general and practical assurance of them, without dividing with his creatures his own prerogatives, who alone sees the future as the present or the past. But the time is certainly near. Before the present century is passed, with fifty-six years yet to run, great revolutions will occur, great changes and transformations in the organizations of society will have been developed. It is doubted by some eminent scholars, if the popedom will exist a quarter of a century longer. The Pope is now most execrated in his own dominions; and by intelligent Italians, who anticipate YOUNG ITALY speedily redeemed from the tyrannous incubus of ages. The bayonets of Austrian and Swiss mercenaries are potential just now, by the policy and the gold of the Imperial Court at Vienna, to subdue or rather repress the patriotic ardor of the nation, and furnish to the triple Tyrant an adequate protection against the swelling indignation of his own subjects. But he is in the last stages of an incurable consumption. His life is only a dying process, and the symptoms of senility, and decay, and dissolution, are multiplied and aggravated on the limbs and features of the execrated body. Its doom is certain and its end is nigh.

Some, indeed, auger differently, from the strenuous efforts of propagandism, now making, with great zeal, and some success, and loud boasting, by the Jesuit missionaries, in different and distant places, and especially in our own menaced republic. To this, we say, the signs are equivocal and portentous. It is no new thing, that, when the tide of life begins to subside near the heart, the extremities should become spasmodically vitalized with extraordinary vigor. But the action is unnatural, morbid, and soon to subside in death. We know of another personage, whose mightiest efforts are the presages and the results of his own anticipated destruction; *having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time*; and HE is the father of popery. These temporary and local successes have been expected by

the students of prophecy; they have been often and long foretold by them; and we are more edified than intimidated by their recent presumption and arrogance. It will be only like the festal impiety, the proud security, and the reckless drunken sleep of ancient Babylon, which God chose as the fitting occasion of her memorable capture and irreparable fall. And so will it be with BABYLON THE GREAT. *Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.*

Our publication will be among the means, we trust, used by eternal Providence to consummate this end. It is adapted to the wants of our country, and will, we think, be read and valued by our intelligent citizens. Let us pity the poor deluded papal laity, "more sinned against than sinning." Let us pray for their conversion, and use every wise and honest expedient to accomplish it, by the blessing of God. Can Americans read the History of the Popes—and yet believe them to be the prophets of heaven and the hallowed masters of the earth! Can they accord to the present dominant Gregory, the pompous titles which he claims—VICARIUS FILII DEI, VESTRA SANCTITAS, SERVUS SERVORUM DOMINI, ET DOMINUS REGUM IN ORBE TERRARUM,\* with other profane and blasphemous appellations without end! A temporal prince as well as a spiritual tyrant, the sword and the keys are quartered on his arms, and significantly united in all his public influence—as it has been for nearly eleven hundred years. From Leo or Gregory the Great, from Hildebrand, from Borgia, to the present time, has this huge ANTICHRIST been enthroned and dominant among the nations. But his days are limited and near their close. The oriental ANTICHRIST rose contemporaneously with the occidental, Mahommed and the

\* That is—THE VICAR OF THE SON OF GOD; YOUR HOLINESS; THE SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF THE LORD; THE LORD OF THE KINGS OF THE WHOLE EARTH: only a few of a much greater assortment. What false humility and nauseous hypocrisy is the third—which ought to be replaced thus: THE WHOLESALE PERSECUTOR AND MURDERER OF THE SAINTS OF GOD!



Pope of Rome, and they shall perish in quick succession—if not both together. The order of events anticipated as probable, which are surely predicted and must be near at hand, and which give hope to faith and will soon give triumph to piety, is as follows :

I. The subversion and destruction of the Roman Antichrist.

II. The fall and explosion of Mahomedism.

III. The conversion of the Jews.

IV. The universal propagation of the gospel, and its ascendancy among the nations.

V. The reign of the millennium—not as a new dispensation, but only as the glory of the present one, with the spiritual—not personal—presence of the Redeemer.

VI. The second coming of Christ; the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of all nations, the conflagration of the world, the punishment of the wicked, the glorification of the righteous, and—

VII. THE MYSTERY OF GOD IS FINISHED.

No doubt there will be judgments and the ministrations of blood, in various places, before the consummation. It will not be all mercy, that is to prepare the way for the grandest triumphs of mercy. But come what will, we know that *the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth*; that his veracity is inviolable, his purposes are not to be frustrated, his cause shall be finally victorious, and his praises celebrated by hundreds of millions of the ransomed to all eternity. His enemies are as weak as they are wicked; and God will manage them as becomes his glory, at whose feet subordinate roll the seasons and the times, and against whose ample and generous and all-perfect monarchy no man ever *hardened himself and prospered*. *And we know that all things work [are working] to-*

*gether for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose.*

Our greatest national dangers arise from our lamentable apathy; as this arises mainly from our ignorance. *While men slept*, says our Saviour, *the enemy sowed tares*. And if “the price of liberty is eternal vigilance,” it ill becomes the heirs of such a boon, from such ancestors as ours, to lose or even to peril the freedom which was purchased by them at the cost of blood. Nor will any thing like indifference suit the occasion. America expects every citizen, as Christ every Christian, to do his duty. And to omit this—ON ANY PRETENCE—is criminal. It is suiting and serving the enemy. It is servility and subserviency to the common foe. *SLEEP ON*, says Rome, *AND WE WILL HAVE YOU!* We need do nothing, but only omit to do our duty, and we act for him; and our ruined posterity may remember only to accuse us, only to execrate our memories. Shall we then be indifferent, and so abet the interests of antichrist? What could we do more truly to favor the worst adversary of this most noble and desirable nation?

*Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ.*

This suits the policy and aim of Rome,  
And seals deceitfully our country's doom.  
The Pope and all his Cardinals would yield  
Their crownly jewels for so fair a field.  
Such apathy were treason to the state  
And church, as well as perfidy ingrate.

We have nothing to do but our duty, as Christians; and that is, to trust God at all times, so to avail our ignorance of his omniscience, our weakness of his almightiness, our ruin of his salvation, and thus to twine the hand of our infantile feebleness in the mighty grasp of his paternal strength, *who is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.*







## THE PREFACE.

---

THE work which I now offer to the public, I undertook some years since at Rome, and brought it down to the pontificate of Victor, that is, to the close of the second century. As I was then a most zealous champion for the pope's supremacy, which was held as an article of faith by the body I belonged to, my chief design, when I engaged in such a work, was to ascertain that supremacy, by showing, century by century, that from the apostles' times to the present, it had ever been acknowledged by the catholic church. But, alas! I soon perceived that I had undertaken more than it was in my power to perform. Nay, while, in order to support and maintain this cause, I examined, with particular attention, the writing of the apostles, and of the many pious and learned men who had flourished in the three first centuries of the church, I was so far from finding any thing that seemed the least to countenance such a doctrine, that, on the contrary, it appeared evident, beyond all dispute, that, during the above mentioned period of time, it had been utterly unknown to the Christian world. In spite then of my endeavors to the contrary, reason getting the better of the strongest prejudices, I began to look upon the pope's supremacy, not only as a prerogative quite chimerical, but as the most impudent attempt that had ever been made: I say, in spite of my endeavors to the contrary; for I was very unwilling to give up a point upon which I had been taught, by Bellarmine, that the whole of Christianity depended;<sup>1</sup> especially in a country, where a man cannot help being afraid even of his own thoughts, since, upon the least suspicion of his only calling in question any of the received opinions, he may depend upon his being soon convinced by more cogent arguments than any in mood

and figure. But great is the power of truth; and at last it prevailed: I became a proselyte to the opinion which I had proposed to confute; and sincerely abjured, in my mind, that which I had ignorantly undertaken to defend.

Being thus fully convinced that the pope's so much boasted supremacy was a bold and ungodly usurpation, I could not help censuring with myself the men of learning who had countenanced such a pretension, especially the two great champions of the papal power, Bellarmine and Baronius. Did they not see what every man, who but dips into the primitive writers, must see; what is obvious to common sense? The poor shifts they are often put to, their ridiculous evasions and cavils, their unmeaning distinctions, their wresting several passages, contrary to the plain and natural meaning of the authors they quote, and, above all, their unsatisfactory answers to the objections of the adverse party, show but too plainly that they wrote not from conviction, nor aimed at truth, but, perhaps, at the red hat, which was afterwards bestowed upon them, as a reward for betraying the truth. Few have written in defence of the pope's supremacy, that have not been preferred; and none perhaps who had not preferment in view. Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II, being asked, before he was raised to the papal chair, how it happened, that, in all disputes between the popes and the councils, many divines sided with the former, and very few with the latter? Because the popes, answered he, have benefices to give, and the councils have none. Had he been asked the same question after he was pope, he would not perhaps have returned the same answer; but said, upon his being put in mind of it, as Gregory XIII did afterwards on a like occasion, that, being raised higher, he saw better and farther. Those, therefore, who have stood up in defence of

---

<sup>1</sup> Bellar. Præf. de Sum. Pont.



the liberty of the church against papal usurpation, cannot be supposed to have had any other inducement to espouse the cause of truth, but truth itself. And this some have had the Christian courage to do, even in Italy, and almost in the pope's hearing, at the peril of their liberty, of their lives, of all that was dear to them; as I shall have occasion to show hereafter. But to return, in the mean time, to the present history: I no sooner found myself in a country where truth might be uttered without danger, than I resolved to resume and pursue, in my native tongue, as soon as I recovered the use of it, the work I had begun in a foreign language. On the one side I saw the only obstruction to an undertaking, which had already cost me no small pains and labour, happily removed; while I flattered myself on the other, that as a complete History of the Popes was still wanting, such a performance might meet with a favorable reception from the public. I am well apprized, that others have at different times, and in different languages, treated the same subject: but whether any of their several works may deserve the name of complete, or even of a tolerable history; I leave those to judge who have perused them; and shall only say in respect to myself, that instead of diverting me from undertaking the same province, they have more than any thing else encouraged me to it. Anastasius and Platina, the two classics, as they are deemed, in this branch of history, have indeed given us the *lives of the popes*, from the foundation of the see of Rome to their times, but in so broken, imperfect, and unsatisfactory a manner, that from them we learn but very little, even concerning those of whom they have said most. It was not their design to write a history, but only to draw as it were in miniature the portraits of the Roman bishops, by relating, in a summary way, such of their actions as appeared to them most worthy of being recorded; and to say the truth, they have both betrayed no less want of discernment in choosing what they should relate, than of exactness in relating what they had chosen.

Anastasius the monk, surnamed Bibliothecarius, that is, library-keeper, secretary, and chancellor of the church of Rome, (for all these employments anciently centred in one person, and were comprised under the common name of

Bibliothecarius,) flourished in the ninth century, under Nicolas I, Adrian II, and John VIII. He wrote a succinct account of the bishops who governed the church of Rome, from St. Peter to Nicolas I, who died in 867. But the memoirs he made use of were none of the best. In his time the world was overrun with forged or corrupted pontificals, martyrologies, legends, &c., which were then no less universally received than they have been since rejected by the learned of all persuasions. However, that from these the bibliothecarian borrowed the greater part of his materials, at least for the six first centuries, is but too apparent, from his overlooking, nay, and often contradicting, the unexceptionable testimonies of contemporary writers; as will be seen in the sequel of the present history. As therefore the records, which he copied, are so justly suspected, and his own authority can be of no weight with respect to those distant times, the reader must not be surprised to find that, in this history, I have paid no manner of regard to an author who has been hitherto blindly followed by those who have written on the same subject. There may, indeed, be some truth in what he relates; but his frequent mistakes render that truth too precarious to be relied on, unless confirmed by the concurring testimonies of other more credible and less credulous authors. However, in the times less remote from his own, I shall readily allow his authority its due weight; the rather, as he seems not to have written with a design of imposing upon others, but to have been imposed upon himself by frauds and forgeries; for he wrote in an age when the world lay involved in the thickest mist of ignorance, when superstition and credulity triumphed without control, and spurious pieces, filled with idle and improbable stories, had thrust every grave writer, nay, and the gospels themselves, out of doors.

Platina, so called from the Latin name of Piadena, a village in the Cremonese, the place of his nativity, (for his true name was Battista, or Bartolomeo Sacchi,) flourished six hundred years after Anastasius, that is, in the fifteenth century, under Calixtus III, Pius II, Paul II, and Sixtus IV. Under Pius II he was secretary of the Datary, the office where vacant benefices are disposed of; but, being dis-



missed by Paul II, though he had purchased the place in the height of his resentment, he appealed to the future council. What he suffered under that pope, first in prison, and afterwards on the rack, we shall hear from himself, in a more proper place. Sixtus IV, the successor of Paul, well apprized of his innocence, took him into favor, and, having enlarged, endowed, and enriched the Vatican library with a great number of valuable books, in different languages, he committed the care of them to him. It was probably at this time that he wrote, or rather transcribed, the Lives of the Popes, from St. Peter, whom he supposes the founder of that see, to Paul II, who died in 1471. I say transcribed; for, if we except the few popes who lived in or near his own times, namely, Eugene IV, Nicolas V, Calixtus III, Pius II, and Paul II, he copied, almost verbatim, all he has said of the rest, only interweaving now and then the profane history with the ecclesiastic.<sup>1</sup> The lives of the fourteen succeeding popes, from Paul II to Pius V, elected in 1566, were compiled by Onuphrius Panvinus, of the Augustin order, a man more commendable for his learning than for his candor and veracity. These are, as we may style them, the original compilers of the lives of the popes: Platina adopted Anastasius's concise method of writing, and Panvinus, Platina's, contenting themselves with bare hints; and thereby putting their readers to the trouble of consulting other writers, in order to gratify the curiosity they had raised. "Much has been said of the popes by other historians, but very little by their own," as the learned Pagi observed, after comparing the authors I have mentioned, with the contemporary historians of other nations. I might well add, that the *very*

*little* they have said has been thought too much; whence some of them, and Platina in particular, have been made, in all their editions since the middle of the sixteenth century, to speak with more reserve, and to suppress or disguise some truths they had formerly told.

As for those who in later times have engaged in the same province, we need only dip into their works to be satisfied, that to search out truth was not their business. Some are all praise and panegyric, others all satire and gall: some have made it their study to excuse the worst of popes, others to arraign the best. That many of the popes have been wicked men, abandonedly wicked, is undeniable, notwithstanding the pains that have been taken to extenuate their crimes; but neither are there wanting some good men among them, of innocent lives, and unblemished characters, whose only crime is their having been popes; and to misrepresent or misconstrue the virtuous actions of these, as some have done, is no less blamable in an historian, than to dissemble or gloss over the criminal actions of the others. This partiality may be easily accounted for with respect to one great period of the present history. During the quarrels and wars between the popes and emperors, which lasted many years, and occasioned, in seventy-eight battles, the destruction of an infinite number of innocent people, two powerful factions reigned, as is well known, both in Germany and Italy, distinguished by the names of Guelphs and Ghibbelines; the former being zealously attached to the papal, and the latter to the imperial interest. In the midst of these distractions, few writers stood neuter, but, siding, according to their different interests or inclinations, with one party or the other, drew their pens, each against the head of the party he opposed, with more rage than the soldiers did their swords. And hence it is, that we find the same facts related by contemporary authors with such different circumstances; the same persons, the emperors especially and the popes, painted in such different colours. Of this very few writers in the later times have been aware; and therefore have, as their bias led them to favor one cause more than the other, adopted as undoubted truths the many groundless aspersions and undeserved reproaches

<sup>1</sup> The authors he thus copied were Anastasius Bibliothecarius, from St. Peter, or rather Linus, to Nicolas I; Gulielmus, likewise Bibliothecarius, from Nicolas I to Alexander II; Pandulphus Pisanus, from Alexander II to Honorius II; Martinus Polonus, from Honorius II to Honorius IV; Theodorus of Niem, from Honorius IV to Urban VI, and from Urban VI to Martin V, who died in 1431; other writers, whose works are extant, but their names unknown. He likewise borrowed a great deal of Ptolemæus Lucensis, a Dominican friar, who flourished, and compiled the lives of the popes, in the time of Boniface VIII, chosen in the year 1294.



which party zeal had suggested to the Ghibbelines against the popes, or to the Guelphs against the emperors. I wish I could entirely clear an eminent Italian historian of our own times from this imputation.

But, after all, as it was not merely with a view to supply the want of a complete history of the popes, that I formerly undertook so laborious a task; neither is it now with that view alone I resume it. What I proposed to myself, when I first undertook it, I have said already; but, being convinced that I labored in vain, and convinced by such evidence as the strongest prejudice could not withstand, I thought it a duty owing to truth, to set it forth to others in the same irresistible light; and to defend, at least with as much zeal, the best of causes, as I had done the worst. A disloyal subject, who had taken up arms against his lawful sovereign, would not be thought entirely to comply with his duty, by only laying them down: he ought, if actuated by a true spirit of loyalty, and truly convinced of the badness of his cause, to range himself under the banners of his injured lord, and devote to his service and defence the sword he had drawn against him. By a like obligation, a writer, who has, even ignorantly, combated truth, is bound, not only to lay down his pen, as soon as he finds himself engaged in a bad cause, but, when occasion offers, to turn against error in favor of truth the very weapon he had employed against truth in favor of error.

But to give the reader some account of the history itself, and the method I have pursued in delivering it: I have entitled it, *The History of the Popes*; but might as well have styled it, *The History of Popery*; since it not only contains an account of the lives and actions of the popes, but of every Popish tenet; when, by whom, on what occasion, and to serve what purpose, each of them was broached; those more especially which relate to the pope as *Christ's Vicar upon earth*, as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, as *an Infallible Guide to salvation*; for these are the prerogatives he claims, as entailed upon, and inseparable from the Roman see. But that no such doctrines were known in the first and purest ages of Christianity; that the Bishop of Rome was then, nay, and thought himself, upon the level with other bishops; that

the Catholic Church acknowledged no power, authority, or jurisdiction in the Bishop of Rome, but what was common to him with all other bishops, will appear so plain from the following history, that I can hardly conceive it possible for any man, however prejudiced in favor of the papal power and popish religion, to peruse it without abjuring the one and the other: I am but too well apprized of the strength of prejudice; but, strong as it is, it can never be proof against plain matter of fact. For who can believe, for instance, in the pope's infallibility, who can help looking upon such an article of belief as the grossest affront that ever was offered to human understanding, when he reads of a Liberius admitting and signing the Arian creed, or confession of faith, declared heretical by all his successors; of an Honorius condemned by the fathers of the sixth œcumenical council, as *an organ of the devil*, for holding the heresy of the Monothelites; of John XXII preaching up and propagating, both by his missionaries and his legates *a latere*, a doctrine which he himself retracted on his death-bed; of seven popes<sup>1</sup> cursing and damning, in emulation of one another, all who denied a certain tenet,<sup>2</sup> and another pope<sup>3</sup> as heartily cursing and damning all who maintained it, nay, and recurring to the *ultima ratio* of the later popes, the fagot, in order to *root out of the Church* (these are his very words) *so pestilential, erroneous, heretical, and blasphemous a doctrine*? This occasioned great scandal in the church, insomuch that some even took the liberty to represent to his holiness, that the decrees and constitutions of one pope could not be reversed by another. The pope replied, (and what other reply could he make?) "That they were mistaken, since it might be proved by innumerable instances, that what had been decreed wrong or amiss by one pope or council could be rectified and

<sup>1</sup> Gregory IX, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Nicolas III, Martin IV, Nicolas IV, Clement V.

<sup>2</sup> That the Franciscan friars had no property, in common or in private; a question, if any ever was, *de lana caprina*. What was it to mankind? what to the Christian religion, whether a few friars had, or had not, any property? No man was the better for believing they had, no man the worse for believing they had not. And yet to read the bulls of the popes, one would think that the whole of Christianity had been at stake.

<sup>3</sup> John XXII.



amended by another." This answer silenced them at once, says our historian: and well it might; I am only surprised that the word infallibility has ever been since heard of. The Franciscan friars, who had occasioned the dispute, paid dear for it: as they continued to plead the infallibility of seven popes against that of one, and obstinately adhered to their doctrine. Pope John, losing all patience, ordered all to be burnt alive who did not receive his constitution; which was done accordingly, and many of those unhappy wretches chose rather to expire in the flames than to yield. These remarkable transactions are related by several contemporary writers of unquestionable authority, and among the rest by Nicolaus Eymericus, who was inquisitor of the province of Tarragon, and has inserted them in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*.<sup>1</sup> Other facts without number, of the same nature, and alike irreconcilable with the other prerogatives claimed by the popes, as well as with the chief articles of the Roman Catholic religion, will occur in this history, and all so well attested, that nothing, I think, can withstand the force of truth thus displayed. Logical arguments and controversial reasoning cannot be well adapted to every understanding, and therefore are not always attended with the desired effect, however skilfully managed; but historical facts lie level to the meanest capacities, and the consequences thence deducible are to the meanest capacities plain and obvious. It is true, the sticklers for the see of Rome have endeavored to darken the clearest facts, since they could not deny them, as being vouched by their own approved authors; but they have done it in so awkward a manner, with such absurd, ridiculous, and unintelligible interpretations, comments, distinctions, &c., that, were it not well known it was their interest to defend that cause, one would be apt to think they intended rather to ridicule than defend it.

But if the popes were originally mere bishops, upon the level with other bishops; if they had no power but what

was common to them with all other bishops; by what means could they thus exalt themselves above their colleagues, nay, *above all that is called God*? What could induce their colleagues, and with them the greater part of the *Christian* world, to acknowledge such an unheard-of power, and submit to a yoke of all others the most heavy and tyrannical? For an answer to these questions I refer the reader to the following history, where he will find every branch of power, authority, or jurisdiction claimed by the popes, traced from its first origin, and the various steps pointed out, by which they raised themselves from the lowest beginnings to the highest pitch of greatness; which is opening a school of the most refined policy that ever was known or practised upon earth. In this respect we must own the popes to have been, generally speaking, men of extraordinary talents, the ablest politicians we read of in history, statesmen fit to govern the world, and equal to the vast dominion they grasped at; a dominion over the minds as well as the bodies and estates of mankind; a dominion, of all that ever were formed, the most wide and extensive, as knowing no other bounds but those of the earth; nay, and not even those, since these mighty princes claim to themselves all power in heaven as well as in earth, all power over the dead as well as the living. To establish the spiritual part of this wondrous authority upon the gospel of Christ, which contradicts it in every line, was an undertaking of no little difficulty, and that required no common skill; to establish the temporal dominion without a fleet, without an army; to subject to it not only the ignorant and superstitious multitude, but kings themselves, nay, and to prevail upon them to employ both their arms and their interest in promoting a power evidently derogatory to and inconsistent with their own; was a work not to be accomplished but by men of superior talents, thoroughly acquainted with all the arts of insinuation and address, and steady in pursuing, by the best concerted measures, the great point that they constantly had in their view.

Two things, however, concurred to facilitate, in some degree, the establishing the one and the other: namely, the profound ignorance of the times, and the matchless cunning of the persons employed by the popes as their emissaries.

<sup>1</sup> Direct. Inquis. part. ii. quæst. 51. See also Antoninus in his *Summa Theologiæ*, part. iv. tit. ii. c. 7, num. 5; Petrus Alliatus Cameracensis; Continuator Nangii ad ann. 1333; Joannes Gerso in *Ser. de Fest. Paschat.* Longus in *Monas. Cicestr. Chronic.* and Gobelinus *Cosmodromii ætat. vi. c. 71.*



ries and agents; without which helps no imposture was ever carried on with success.

It was *in the night, while men slept*, while the earth was overspread with the darkest night of ignorance, that *the enemy came, and sowed his tares*. From the beginning of the seventh century to the time of the reformation, letters were utterly neglected; and in proportion to that neglect, credulity and superstition, the inseparable companions of ignorance, prevailed among the laity even of the highest ranks: the little knowledge that still remained (and very little did remain) was wholly confined to the clergy, chiefly to the monks, men most zealously attached to the interest of the pope, as well knowing that by promoting his interest they promoted at the same time their own. It was in this period of time, in this long darkness of ignorance, credulity, and superstition, that the pope and his agents introduced maxims and notions concerning the papal prerogatives, very different from those which the world had entertained to that time. In the beginning of the seventh century, that is, in the year 606, Pope Boniface III, a man of great address, having craftily insinuated himself into the favor of Phocas, obtained of that traitor and murderer<sup>1</sup> the famous rescript settling the supremacy on the see of Rome, in opposition to the claim of the patriarch of Constantinople. As Phocas bore an irreconcilable hatred to Cyriacus, who was then vested with the patriarchal dignity, he was the more easily prevailed upon to decide the controversy, which had already lasted a long time between the two sees, in favor of the see of Rome. If this hatred in the usurper was owing to the zeal of Cyriacus in laying before him the enormity of his crime, and exhorting him to repentance, Boniface, nay, and his predecessor St. Gregory the Great,<sup>2</sup> knew better how to make their court to men in

power than to take the least notice of their sins, however public, or mention *repentance* in their hearing. Be that as it will, it is certain that to this monster of wickedness the Church of Rome owes her supremacy. And it was this grant from Phocas that, more than any thing else, inspired the bishops of Rome with pride and presumption; which increasing as their power increased, they were carried by degrees to all the excesses an unbounded ambition can suggest, when free from all curb of conscience, morality, and religion.

Yet, after all, the supremacy granted by Phocas was but a supremacy of order and dignity; it gave no *new* power to the Bishop of Rome, but only raised him above his colleagues, especially his rival, the patriarch of Constantinople; and made him, as some express it, *the first among his equals*. But his successors, thirsting after power, and scorning to hold their dignity by so precarious a tenure as the emperor's pleasure, which might hereafter revoke the decision of Phocas, and give the precedence in rank to Constantinople instead of Rome, began to disown the favor they had received, to set up for themselves, and to claim the supremacy, as inherent by divine right in their see, and derived from St. Peter, as chief of the apostles, and head of the church. Thus was the foundation of the supremacy changed; and wisely changed, according to the rules of human policy. The old foundation was no ways proportioned to the immense superstructure which they now began to design; since they could claim but very little power, if any at all, in virtue of the emperor's grant. But the new foundation was capable of bearing whatever the most unbounded and aspiring ambition could build on it. Besides, the Bishop of Rome could not challenge, by a rescript of the Roman emperor, any superiority over the churches that had no dependence on the Roman empire. But a supremacy, inherent by divine right in the papal dignity, raised him at once above all the bishops of the catholic church. What therefore now remained was, to improve this extensive supremacy into a no less extensive power and jurisdiction. And here no time was lost, many circumstances concurring to promote and forward the execution of their attempt. Besides the ignorance of the times, and the influence

<sup>1</sup> Phocas settled himself on the imperial throne by the murder of Mauritius, his lawful sovereign, and the massacre of his six children, and of all his friends and relations. Five of his children he caused to be inhumanly butchered in the presence of their father.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory styles him a most pious and religious prince; caused his image, and that of his wife Leontia, who was no better than he, to be lodged in an oratory at Rome; and, congratulating him on his advancement to the throne, ascribes it to a particular providence.



of the monks, which operated strongly in their behalf, the princes of Europe were quarrelling among themselves about the western parts of the Roman empire, and all glad to purchase, at any rate, the friendship of the Bishop of Rome, who, after the famous donation of Pepin in 754, had taken great state upon him, and bore a considerable sway in all public affairs. As for the bishops, and the rest of the secular clergy, they looked upon the pope, especially after he had added the sword to the keys, as their protector and defender; and were on that consideration disposed to concur in strengthening his power, and rendering it formidable, though at the expense of their own; choosing rather to subject themselves to an ecclesiastical master than to submit to the civil authority. I might add, that some now began to mind the fleece more than the flock: and with that it was some time before the popes thought it proper to meddle; but when they did, they soon retrieved, by the haste that they made, the time they had lost.

Yet I do not believe that they designed at first to run those lengths, or carry the papal prerogative to that extravagant height they afterwards did. The success that attended them in the pursuit of one claim, encouraged them to set up and pursue another. Of this no one can doubt, who peruses with the least attention the records of those ages, and compares the popes in the beginning of the seventh century with the popes in the latter end of the eleventh. We shall find them, in the first-mentioned period of time, submitting with all humility to princes; claiming no kind of authority or jurisdiction whatsoever but in virtue of the canons of councils, or the rescripts of emperors; glorying, or pretending to glory, in the humble title of servants of servants; acknowledging themselves subjects and vassals of the emperors, and patiently waiting the will and pleasure of their liege-lords to take upon them the episcopal dignity, or exercise the functions of that office. Such were the bishops of Rome in the beginning of the seventh century. How different from those in the latter end of the eleventh! They were then vested with the *plenitude of all power*, both spiritual and temporal; above councils, and uncontrolled by their canons; the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and authority;

and, by divine sanction, empowered to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, all ecclesiastical laws and constitutions: they were then become lords and masters; the most haughty and imperious lords, the most severe masters mankind had ever groaned under: they no more begged, but dispensed titles, boasting a power of setting up kings, and pulling them down at pleasure; of calling them to an account, absolving their subjects from their allegiance, divesting them of their dominions, and treating in every respect as their slaves and vassals, those whom one of their best and greatest predecessors<sup>1</sup> had acknowledged *superior to all men*, and thought himself *in duty bound to obey*. This *plenitude of power*, as they style it, was not acquired at once, but by degrees, as I have observed above; some of the popes being more, and some less active, crafty, and aspiring. But what is very remarkable, of the one hundred and fourteen between Boniface III, who laid the foundation of the papal grandeur, and Gregory VII, who raised it to the highest pitch, not one ever lost an inch of ground his predecessors had gained. And thus, by constantly acquiring, and never parting with what they had acquired, nay, and tying the hands of their successors by the irreversible entail of a divine right, they became the sole spiritual lords, and had almost made themselves the greatest temporal lords of the whole Christian world.

But by what particular means they rose to such a height of grandeur and majesty, by what artifices and subtle contrivances they maintained what they had usurped, and strove to retrieve what they had lost, when it pleased Divine Providence to check and restrain within more narrow bounds their overgrown power, the reader will learn from the following history. Some of the arts they have made use of are of the most refined, and some of the blackest nature; and both I have endeavored, in this work, to set forth in their truest light, without disguise or exaggeration; those more especially which the popes and their agents have formerly employed, and still employ, to bring anew under their yoke such nations as have had the Christian courage to shake it off, and assert that *liberty, wherewith Christ has*

<sup>1</sup> Gregory the Great.



*made us free.* If I shall be so happy as thereby to keep awake and alive, in the breast of every true Englishman, that noble ardor, which has, on a late occasion, exerted itself in so distinguished a manner; if it shall please Heaven to second my undertaking so far, as to alarm by it those Protestants (I wish I might not say those *many* Protestants) who are not aware of, nor sufficiently guarded against, the crafty insinuations, the secret views and attempts of the papal emissaries; I shall think the time and pains it has cost me abundantly paid.

I am well apprized of the reception a work of this nature must meet with, and of the treatment its author must expect, both at home and abroad, from the popish zealots. But let them vent their zeal in what manner they please, I shall neither answer nor resent their reproaches and censures, however malignant and groundless: nay, I shall hear them with as much pleasure and satisfaction as I should the praises and commendations of others; it being no less meritorious in a writer to have displeased the enemies of truth, than to have pleased the friends. And these, I flatter myself, will find no great room for censure: it would grieve me if they should, since I have done all that lay in my power to leave none. I have advanced nothing for which I have not sufficient vouchers: and these I have taken care to quote in the margin, that the reader, by recurring to the places pointed out in each author, may be convinced of my sincerity and candor. I have always preferred the contemporary writers, when equally credible, to those who wrote after, though not without taking notice of their disagreement; and such as flourished nearest the times when the transactions happened, which they relate, to those who lived at a greater distance. Pursuant to this rule, in delivering the lives of the bishops who governed the Church of Rome during the first ages of Christianity, I have confined myself wholly to the primitive writers, trusting no modern any farther, than as he wrote from the ancients. From these there is no appeal; it is by them, and them alone, that the papal supremacy must stand or fall. If they have all conspired to misrepresent the sense of the ages in which they lived, (and it is only by this hypothesis that the supremacy can be supported,) in what other monuments shall we search for it?

The partiality, which I have so much complained of above in the works of others, I have taken all possible care to avoid in my own; checking the very first emotions of that zeal, which, on my reflecting how long, and how grossly I had been imposed upon, would, if not carefully watched, have proved as strong a bias in me against the pope, and the popish religion, as the opposite zeal has proved for them in others. The vices and vicious actions of the bad popes I have not dissembled; but neither have I magnified them: the virtues and commendable actions of the good popes I have neither lessened nor misconstrued; nay, I have more than once justified the conduct and character of some pious men among them, greatly injured by their own historians, because they lived, and suffered mankind to live, in peace; applying themselves solely, as it became good bishops, to the discharge of their pastoral duty. These their historians have strangely misrepresented, measuring the merit of each pope by the great things they achieved, no matter by what means, for the exaltation of their see; which, in other terms, is measuring their merit by their pride and ambition.

The length of this history requires, I presume, no apology. Every one knows that the popes acted, for several ages, as the umpires of Europe, or rather as the sovereigns; several princes being actually their vassals, and the rest affecting to pay them the same respect as if they were. This emboldened them to intermeddle in the public affairs of each state and kingdom; insomuch that no remarkable event happened, no revolution, no change of government or constitution, which they did not either promote or oppose, as it suited their interest, with too many of them the only standard of right and wrong; and their authority, through the ignorance, credulity, and superstition of those unhappy times, was, generally speaking, of such weight as to turn the scale into which it was thrown. Besides, they had, in every kingdom and nation, their legates or vicars, who, together with the clergy, formed, as it were, a separate state, and one kingdom or empire within another. These, at the instigation of the popes, their lords and masters, were constantly encroaching on the civil authority and jurisdiction, on the rights of the people, and prerogatives of princes. Hence



arose innumerable disputes, which, if princes did not comply with their demands, ended in anathemas, interdicts, civil wars, rebellions, private assassinations, and public massacres. Those who are versed in the histories of other nations, as well as in that of our own, and know what a considerable part the detail of these fatal disputes takes up in the particular histories of each state and kingdom, will not find fault with the length of this, which, if complete, and as such I offer it to the public, must comprise them all. Besides, I have given a summary account of the many heresies that have sprung up in the church; of the councils that have been held; of the religious and military orders; of their founders, institutions, fundamental laws, &c.; subjects all, in some degree, connected with the history of the popes.

I do not doubt but this work will meet with a favorable reception from Protestants of all denominations; such a reception, I mean, as is due to truth. It will, I flatter myself, retard, at least, the daily increase of the papal interest in

these happy kingdoms. As for the Roman Catholics here, would they but lay aside their prejudices, so far as to peruse it with the least degree of candor and attention, I am confident truth would exert its power no less efficaciously upon some of them than it has done upon me. They cannot surely be more biassed in favor of the errors they had been brought up in, than I was. In them truth has but one enemy to contend with, education; in me it had two, education and interest; and the latter is but too often the more powerful of the two. What I forfeited by adhering to truth, most of the Roman Catholics in England well know; and I am very confident none of them can say that I have ever yet reaped, or sought to reap, the least temporal benefit from it. If, therefore, the power of truth, when duly displayed, is so great as to triumph thus over the combined force of education and interest, we may well hope that it will, at least in some, triumph over education alone: I most heartily wish it may in all.







2

---

THE

HISTORY OF THE POPES.

---



THE

HISTORY

OF

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE

THE

HISTORY OF THE



THE  
HISTORY  
OF THE  
POPES, OR BISHOPS OF ROME.

---

ST. PETER.

---

That St. Peter was ever at Rome, known only by tradition. Tradition not to be depended upon. Fabulous accounts of St. Peter. The greatest men imposed upon by false traditions.

---

It is out of some regard to an ancient tradition, that I have placed St. Peter at the head of the Bishops of Rome, though I am well apprized that this, like most other traditions, will hardly stand the test of a strict and impartial examination. To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. If it is affirmed by him alone, we can at most but suspend our belief, not rejecting it as false, because a liar may sometimes speak truth; but we cannot, upon his bare authority, admit it as true. Now that St. Peter was at Rome, that he was Bishop of Rome, we are told by tradition alone, which, at the same time, tells us of so many strange circumstances attending his coming to that metropolis, his staying in it, his withdrawing from it, &c., that, in the opinion of every unprejudiced man, the whole must savor strongly of romance. Thus we are told, that St. Peter went to Rome chiefly to oppose Simon, the celebrated magician; that, at their first interview, at which Nero himself was present, he flew up into the air, in the sight of the emperor, and the whole city; but that the devil, who had thus raised him, struck with dread and terror at the name of Jesus, whom the apostle invoked, let him fall to the ground, by which fall he broke his legs. Should you question the truth of this tradition at Rome, they would show you the prints of St. Peter's knees in the stone, on which he kneeled on this occasion, and another stone still dyed with the blood of the magician.<sup>1</sup>

The Romans, as we are told, highly incensed against him for thus maiming, and bringing to disgrace, one to whom they paid divine honours, vowed his destruction; whereupon the apostle thought it advisable to retire for a while from the city, and had already reached the gate, when, to his great surprise, he met our Saviour coming in, as he went out, who, upon St. Peter's asking him where he was going, returned this answer, "I am going to Rome to be crucified anew:" which, as St. Peter understood it, was upbraiding him with his flight; whereupon he turned back, and was soon after seized by the provoked Romans, and, by an order from the emperor, crucified. These, and a thousand like stories, however fabulous and romantic they may seem, we cannot, without great incoherency, reject, if we admit St. Peter to have been at Rome; since the whole is equally vouched by the same authority, and has been upon the same authority equally believed by those who are called in, by the advocates for the see of Rome, to witness St. Peter's having preached the gospel in that city. These are Arnobius,<sup>1</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> Eusebius,<sup>3</sup> Irenæus,<sup>4</sup> Tertullian,<sup>5</sup> Jerom,<sup>6</sup> and Justin the martyr.<sup>7</sup> These have all supposed St. Peter to have been at Rome, and, together with St. Paul, to have planted Christianity in that great metropolis of the world; but this they took upon tradition, and consequently their authority is of no greater weight than tradition itself, which, had they duly examined, they would not perhaps have so readily pinned their faith upon it. False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them. How many tradi-

<sup>1</sup> This account seems to have been borrowed from Suetonius, who speaks of a person that, in the public sports, undertook to fly in the presence of the Emperor Nero; but, on his first attempt, fell to the ground; by which fall his blood sprang out with such violence, that it reached the emperor's canopy. Suet. l. 6, c. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Arnob. l. 2, in Gent.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 2, c. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Tert. de anim. c. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Justin. apol. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. catech. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Iren. l. 2, c. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. de vir. illustr. c. 9.



How little regard paid to them by some popes. No mention in the Scripture of St. Peter's having ever been at Rome. St. Paul, in the many letters he wrote from Rome, never mentions St. Peter.

tions, after having reigned for ages without control, were, upon the Reformation, when men took the liberty to examine what they believed, rejected by the church, ashamed to own them, and degraded into popular errors! But that of St. Peter's having been at Rome, and the first bishop of that city, was a tradition of too great consequence not to be maintained at all events, since upon that chiefly was founded the claim of his pretended successors to an uncontrolled authority, and universal jurisdiction; a foundation infinitely too weak for such an immense superstructure.

And here I cannot help observing the little regard that the popes themselves have shown to tradition, though received by the greatest lights of the church, when it did not promote the honour or interest of their see. Of this we have a glaring instance in a parallel case; for as St. Peter, according to tradition, travelled to Rome, so did St. Paul, according to tradition, travel into Spain: the former tradition was received by the writers I have quoted above, and the latter by some of the same writers, namely, by Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> and Jerom,<sup>2</sup> and by Athanasius,<sup>3</sup> Chrysostom,<sup>4</sup> Theodoret,<sup>5</sup> Gregory the Great,<sup>6</sup> and many others; yet such a tradition was rejected, perhaps justly, by Pope Innocent I., who would not allow St. Paul to have ever been in Spain.<sup>7</sup> Have we not an equal right to question, or even to deny, St. Peter's having ever been at Rome? Are not the authorities at least equal on both sides? Why then must the travels of one apostle be looked upon as an article of faith, and those of the other be deemed fabulous?

And truly, if we examine narrowly into this matter, the former tradition will appear no less groundless to us than the latter did to that pope: for, in the first place, neither St. Peter himself, nor any of the sacred writers, give us the least hint or intimation of his having ever been at Rome. We are told of his being at Antioch, at Jerusalem, at Corinth, at Babylon;<sup>8</sup> but of the great metropolis of the empire, where he is supposed to have fixed his see, not the least mention is made. And may we not, from that silence, question, to say no more, his having ever been there? I know that by Babylon, from whence St. Peter wrote his first epistle,<sup>9</sup> Eusebius,<sup>10</sup> Jerom,<sup>11</sup> the venerable Bede,<sup>12</sup> Oecumenius,<sup>13</sup> and Grotius,<sup>14</sup> understood Rome; but this is a bare conjecture, and no better grounded than that of others, who thought that by Babylon was meant Jerusalem.<sup>15</sup> The learned Dr. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, seeing no occasion here to recur to a figurative sense, is of opinion, that the

above-mentioned epistle was written not from Babylon in Chaldæa, which then lay in ruins, but from Babylon in Egypt; and no man has taken more pains to make the world believe that St. Peter preached at Rome, and founded that see.<sup>1</sup> But, in this controversy, the silence of St. Paul in particular, if duly attended to, must be thought, by every unbiassed man, a far more convincing proof of St. Peter's not having been at Rome, than all the authorities that have been yet alleged are of his having been there. For that apostle, while at Rome, had frequent opportunities of mentioning his fellow-apostle, and fellow-labourer; and yet, naming several others, he is quite silent as to him. From Rome he wrote to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, to Timothy, and to Philemon, without ever mentioning Peter, or sending any salutation from him; nay, it is certain, that St. Peter was not at Rome when the apostle of the gentiles wrote to the Colossians; for, mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, he adds, "These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort unto me."<sup>2</sup> Peter was not there, when St. Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy, where he says, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me:"<sup>3</sup> nor was he there immediately before St. Paul's death, when "the time of his departure was at hand;" for he tells Timothy, that "all the brethren did salute him;" and, naming Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia,<sup>4</sup> he omits Peter, whom we may thence conclude not to have been there. And yet it is a received tradition in the Church of Rome, that St. Peter was then not only in that metropolis, but confined and bound in the same prison with St. Paul. As that apostle, in writing from Rome, sends no salutations from Peter, so in writing to Rome he greets many others, but never mentions him.<sup>5</sup> Now who would not sooner choose to reject such traditions, than to suppose St. Paul guilty of such an unfriendly and unaccountable omission?

From what has been hitherto said, every impartial judge must conclude, that it is, at least, very much to be doubted whether St. Peter was ever at Rome; but, allowing him to have been there, it still remains to be proved that he was bishop of that see. This the sticklers for the papal authority spare no pains to make out, being well apprized that the whole of their cause lies here at stake; and yet I find nothing alleged by them in so material a point, but a few misinterpreted passages out of the ecclesiastical writers: for the right understanding of which it is to be observed, that such of the ancients as called Peter Bishop of Rome, and Rome the place, the chair, the see of Peter, meant no more

<sup>1</sup> Cyr. cat. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. in Isai. xi. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ad Drac.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. ad Hebr. præf.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Greg. in Joh. xxiii. 22.

<sup>7</sup> Concil. tom. 2, p. 1245.

<sup>8</sup> Acts xi. 2, xv. 7; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9; Gal. ii. 11; 1 Pet. v. 13; 1 Cor. i. 12.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13.

<sup>10</sup> Euseb. l. 2, c. 15.

<sup>11</sup> Hier. vir. illust. c. 8.

<sup>12</sup> Bed. tom. 5, p. 713.

<sup>13</sup> Oecu. p. 526.

<sup>14</sup> Grot. synops. in Pet.

<sup>15</sup> Vide Grot. ib. p. 1541.

<sup>1</sup> Pears. oper. posth. p. 56, et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Coloss. iv. 11.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. iv. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Ad. Rom. xvi. 3—15.



St. Peter, though at Rome, not Bishop of Rome. In what sense St. Peter and St. Paul styled Bishops of Rome. The duties of a bishop and an apostle inconsistent. Whether James the apostle was Bishop of Jerusalem.

than that he was superintendent of that church, that he founded it by converting men to the faith, and erected the episcopal chair, by appointing the first bishops. That this was their true meaning, is apparent from what we read in Ruffinus; who, having mentioned Linus, Cletus, and Clemens, as succeeding each other in the see of Rome, while Peter was still alive, thus accounts for their episcopacy: they were, says he, appointed bishops by Peter, to the end that, they taking upon them the episcopal charge, he might be at leisure to discharge the duties of his apostolical office. And this, he tells us, was not a notion of his own, but the common opinion.<sup>1</sup> Irenæus speaks to the same purpose: "the apostles," says he, "founding that church, delivered the episcopal office into the hands of Linus."<sup>2</sup> Hence the most ancient writers, who lived nearest the fountain of tradition, never style St. Peter Bishop of Rome, but only say, that, by ordaining bishops, he founded that church.<sup>3</sup> St. Peter, therefore, was not Bishop of Rome in the strict sense, to which that word is now confined, but in the more large sense, of which I have taken notice above: and in that St. Paul has as good a claim to the high-sounding titles of Pope, Bishop of Rome, &c. as St. Peter, since, together with him, he is said to have founded that church. The popes indeed will not allow him that honor, nor condescend to reckon him among their predecessors; but Epiphanius and Eusebius have been more complaisant; of whom the former says, "Peter and Paul were the first at Rome, both bishops and apostles;"<sup>4</sup> and the latter speaking of the succession of the Bishops of Rome, "Alexander derived his succession in the fifth place from Peter and Paul."<sup>5</sup> Both therefore were Bishops of Rome, or neither; both in the sense of the ancient writers, but neither in that which is now annexed to the word *bishop*. And truly the office of an apostle, and that of a bishop, as the word is now understood, are incompatible. An apostle, says Chrysostom,<sup>6</sup> is charged with the instruction not of any particular nation or city, but of the whole world; but a bishop must reside, says the same writer,<sup>7</sup> and be employed in one place: and therefore St. Peter, who knew these two duties to be inconsistent, if he was ever at Rome, committed there, as he did in other places, the episcopal charge to others, and pursued his apostolical office, which required a more extensive care.

But St. James, say the popish writers, though an apostle, was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem; and why might not St. Peter, though an apostle, undertake the episcopacy of Rome? It is surprising they should lay so much stress as they do on this objection, since they must know it to be grounded on

an uncertainty; as Eusebius the greatest antiquary of former times,<sup>1</sup> Hegeſippus the most ancient historian,<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>3</sup> Jerom,<sup>4</sup> Gregory of Nysse,<sup>5</sup> Chrysostom,<sup>6</sup> and many others, reckon James, bishop of Jerusalem, not among the apostles, but the seventy disciples. Of the same opinion among the moderns, are Grotius,<sup>7</sup> Dr. Hammond,<sup>8</sup> Valesius,<sup>9</sup> Blondel,<sup>10</sup> and Salmasius.<sup>11</sup> The last of these saying, after his positive and confident manner, "It is certain that he was not one of the twelve," I may at least say, it is not certain that he was; and consequently the objection can be of no considerable weight. But allowing him to have been one of the twelve, as some of the ancients seem to think,<sup>12</sup> there was a special reason, why one of the apostles should be appointed to reside at Jerusalem, that city being the metropolis, the fountain, the centre of the Christian religion; our faith had there had its birth; the church was there very numerous, consisting of many thousands of believing Jews;<sup>13</sup> and thither resorted great numbers of those of that nation, who were converted to Christ in other countries. On these considerations it might seem expedient, that a person of the greatest authority should preside there. But there was no special reason why an apostle should constantly reside at any other place, nor does it appear that any did: St. Peter especially could not reside at any one place, since to him, as "the apostle of the circumcision," was committed the charge of converting the dispersed Jews in all parts of the world.

As for the appellations of the apostolic see, chair, throne, &c., given by the ancients to the see of Rome, they import no more than that it was erected by an apostle; for they are bestowed indiscriminately on all the sees, in which bishops had been placed by the apostles; viz., of Ephesus,<sup>14</sup> of Smyrna,<sup>15</sup> of Alexandria,<sup>16</sup> of Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi,<sup>16</sup> &c. The title of apostolic see, common to many, was, in process of time, by the ambition of the Bishops of Rome, appropriated to their own. They had, as they thought, till the year 1662, a pregnant proof not only of St. Peter's erecting their chair, but of his sitting in it himself; for till that year, the very chair, on which they believed, or would make others believe, he had sat, was shown and exposed to public adoration on the 18th of January, the festival of the said chair. But while it was cleaning, in order to be set up in some conspicuous place of the Vatican, the Twelve Labours of Her-

<sup>1</sup> Ruffin. in præf. ad Clem. recogn.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. apud Euseb. c. 5, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. apost. 7, 46; Iren. 3, 3. <sup>4</sup> Epiph. hæ. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. iv. c. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Chrys. tom. 8, p. 115.

<sup>7</sup> Idem, Eph. iv. 11.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. i. c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Hegeſ. apud Euseb. l. 2, c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Epiph. hæ. 78.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. de vir. ill.

<sup>5</sup> Greg. p. 279.

<sup>6</sup> Chrys. in Mat. hom. 33.

<sup>7</sup> Grot. in Jac. i. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Hamm. dissert. Ignat. 4, 3.

<sup>9</sup> Val. in Euseb. i. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Blond. in epist. Clem. ad Jacob.

<sup>11</sup> Wal. Mess. p. 20.

<sup>12</sup> Aug. cont. Cres. l. 2, c. 37. Vide Pears. Ann. Paulin. p. 58.

<sup>13</sup> Acts xxi. 20.

<sup>14</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Idem ib. et Tertull. de præſ. hæret. c. 32; Euseb. l. 3, c. 36.

<sup>16</sup> Tertull. ib. c. 36.



St. Peter how, or by whom, placed in the See of Rome. Other Bishops of Rome appointed by St. Peter.  
St. Peter bishop at Rome, not of Rome. Linus, and not Clement the Bishop of Rome.

cules unluckily appeared engraved on it. Our worship however, says Giacomo Bartolini, who was present at this discovery, and relates it, was not misplaced, since it was not to the wood we paid it; but to the prince of the apostles, St. Peter.<sup>1</sup> An author of no mean character, unwilling to give up the holy chair, even after this discovery, as having a place and a peculiar solemnity among the other saints, has attempted to explain the labours of Hercules in a mystical sense, as emblems representing the future exploits of the popes.<sup>2</sup> But the ridiculous and distorted conceits of that writer are not worthy our notice, though by Clement X. they were judged not unworthy of a reward.

But to return to our subject; it may be inquired, If St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, who placed him in that see? Did our Lord appoint him? Did the apostles name him? Did the people choose him? Did he assume it himself? To these queries no answers have been yet given, but such as are so ridiculously weak, that it is not worth my while to relate them, nor the reader's to hear them. Bellarmine, in one place, positively affirms, that "God commanded St. Peter to fix his see at Rome;"<sup>3</sup> but elsewhere contents himself with saying, "It is not improbable that God commanded St. Peter to fix his see at Rome."<sup>4</sup> If it is no more than not improbable, it is uncertain; it may be a mere conjecture, a dream.

St. Peter, either alone, or jointly with St. Paul, as we read in Irenæus, and in the Apostolical Constitutions,<sup>5</sup> appointed other bishops of Rome. Now, when he appointed others, did he resign his episcopacy, or retain

it? If he resigned it, he did not die Bishop of Rome; which shakes the very foundation of the pope's claim to supremacy: if he retained it, there were two bishops on the same see at one time; which Pope Innocent I. in his epistle to the clergy and people of Constantinople, condemned as an irregularity never known till his time:<sup>1</sup> he did not, it seems, recollect that it had been practised by his predecessor, Pope Peter. Theodoret tells us, in his Ecclesiastical History, that when the Emperor Constantius would have had Felix to sit in the see of Rome, together with Liberius, upon the return of the latter from banishment, the people of Rome would not consent to it, crying out, "One God, one Christ, one bishop." Felix died soon after, and upon his death Theodoret makes the following remark: "It was," says he, "a special providence, that Peter's throne might not suffer infamy, being held by two prelates."<sup>2</sup> He did not consider, or rather did not believe, that it had been held by St. Peter and St. Paul, by St. Peter and by Linus.

To conclude, St. Peter was perhaps bishop at Rome, not of Rome.<sup>3</sup> He was bishop at Rome, if he ever was there, being, in virtue of his apostleship, empowered to discharge, at Rome, and everywhere else, all episcopal functions; but was not specially Bishop of Rome, or any other place; that is, he did not take upon him the charge of any particular bishop, the administration of any particular bishopric, that being inconsistent both with the dignity and office of an apostle, or universal bishop.

## LINUS, FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[NERO, GALBA, OTHO, VITELLIUS, VESPASIAN, TITUS.]

[Year of Christ, 66.] THERE is a great disagreement among the ancients about the first Bishops of Rome: Tertullian makes Clement, whom he supposes to have been ordained by St. Peter, the immediate *successor of that apostle*.<sup>6</sup> He was followed therein by Ruffinus,<sup>7</sup> and Ruffinus by the Latins in general; among whom that opinion universally prevailed towards the end of the fourth century. But Jerom, rejecting the opinion of the Latins, places Linus immediately after the apostles, Anacletus next to him, and Cle-

ment in the third place.<sup>4</sup> His opinion is supported by the authority of Irenæus,<sup>5</sup> Eusebius,<sup>6</sup> Theodoret,<sup>7</sup> and likewise of Epiphanius,<sup>8</sup> Optatus Milevitanus,<sup>9</sup> and St. Augustin,<sup>10</sup> with this difference, that Epiphanius gives the name of Cletus to the successor of Linus, and both Optatus and St. Augustin place him after Clement; but in this they all agree, that Linus was the first, after the apostles, who governed the Church of Rome. To the authority of these writers I may add that of the Apostolic Constitutions, telling

<sup>1</sup> Bartol. Antichità sacre di Roma, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Luchesini catedra restituita a S. Pietro.

<sup>3</sup> Bell. de sum. Pont. l. 4, c. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. l. 2 c. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. apud Euseb. l. 5, c. 6, et Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. de præsc. hæret. c. 32. <sup>7</sup> Recog. p. 398.

<sup>1</sup> Inn. I. apud Soz. l. 8, c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. Hist. Eccles. l. 2, c. 17.

<sup>3</sup> 'Tis a distinction made by a pope, King in Etruria, not of Etruria.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. vir. illust. c. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 2, 4, 21.

<sup>7</sup> Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 21.

<sup>8</sup> Epiph. hæret. 27 c. 6.

<sup>9</sup> Optat. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>10</sup> Aug. ep. 165.



Whether Clement appointed by St. Peter to succeed him. Linus no martyr, though placed among the Martyrs. Books ascribed to him.

us, in express terms, that Linus was ordained Bishop of Rome by St. Paul.<sup>1</sup> As to what we read in Tertullian and Ruffinus, namely, that Clement was ordained by St. Peter, and named to succeed him; Dr. Hammond answers, that Clement governed with episcopal power and jurisdiction the converted Jews, while Linus and Anacletus governed, with the same power, the converted gentiles. He adds, That upon the death of Anacletus, both churches were united under him.<sup>2</sup> Thus he strives to reconcile the opinion of the Latins, placing Clement immediately after the apostles, with that of the Greeks, allowing him only the third place: for granting what he advances to be true, and reasons are not wanting to support it, Clement was, agreeably to the opinion of the Latins, the immediate successor of the apostles, with respect to the Jews; but, with respect to the gentiles, he succeeded Anacletus, agreeably to the opinion of the Greeks.<sup>3</sup> This answer Cotelerius applauds as an ingenious, learned, and probable solution; but, at the same time, rejects it as contradicting, in his opinion, the Apostolic Constitutions, and not supported by the authority of any ancient writer.<sup>4</sup> The learned Dr. Pearson will admit no opinion that supposes two bishops to have presided together in one city,<sup>5</sup> that being an irregularity, according to St. Cyprian,<sup>6</sup> *contrary to the ecclesiastic disposition, contrary to the evangelic law, contrary to the rules of the catholic institution*, and condemned as such by the council of Nice.<sup>7</sup> It is very much to be doubted, as I have shown above, whether St. Peter ever was at Rome, and consequently whether Clement was ordained, by him, bishop of that city. His not succeeding him is a proof that he was not; for who can imagine that the people and clergy of those days would have thought of choosing any other, or that any other, though chosen, would have accepted of a dignity, to which Clement had been named by St. Peter himself, and which he was actually possessed of at the apostle's death? Be that as it will, Linus is now universally acknowledged both by the Greeks and Latins for the first Bishop of Rome.

As for the life and actions of Linus, all I can find in the ancients concerning him, is, that it was he whom St. Paul mentioned in

his epistle to Timothy;<sup>1</sup> that, upon the authority of the Apostolic Constitutions, he was supposed, by some, to have been the son of Claudia, whom the apostle mentions in the same place;<sup>2</sup> and that his life and conversation were much approved of by the people.<sup>3</sup> The Church of Rome allows him, in the canon of the mass, a place among the martyrs; but no mention is made of his having suffered for the faith, either in the ancient martyrologies, or in Irenæus, who, speaking of him, and his immediate successors, distinguishes none but Telesphorus with the title of Martyr. Baronius, determined to maintain, right or wrong, the credit of the sacred canon, in opposition to all the ancients, nay, and to his own system, cuts off one year from the pontificate of Linus, that he may place his death under Vespasian, and not, as Eusebius has done,<sup>4</sup> under Titus, in whose reign he owns none to have suffered for the faith.<sup>5</sup> Had he remembered what he must have read in Tertullian and Eusebius, he had saved himself that trouble: for Tertullian assures us, that Vespasian made no laws against the Christians;<sup>6</sup> and Eusebius, that he did not molest them, though he caused a diligent search to be made after those who were of the race of David, which occasioned a dreadful persecution against the Jews.<sup>7</sup> Linus governed the Church of Rome, according to Eusebius<sup>8</sup> and Epiphanius,<sup>9</sup> twelve years; so that, if we place, with them, the death of St. Peter in 66, Linus must have died in the year 78, of the Christian era. We have, under the name of Linus, two books of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul;<sup>10</sup> but they are generally looked upon as supposititious.<sup>11</sup> Trithemius makes him the author of the Life of St. Peter, in which a particular account was given of the dispute between that apostle and Simon the magician. This piece has not reached our times, and was perhaps of the same stamp with the other, since it is never mentioned either by Eusebius, or St. Jerom. The decrees, that are ascribed to him, are nowhere to be found but in Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and suchlike writers, whose authority is of no weight in matters so distant, unless supported by the testimony of the ancients.

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Hamm. l. 5, c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. p. 247, 258.

<sup>4</sup> Cotel. in not. Const. p. 293.

<sup>5</sup> Pears posthum. p. 159, 161. <sup>6</sup> Cypr. ep. 44, 46, 52, 55.

<sup>7</sup> Syn. Nic. can. 8.

<sup>1</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3; Euseb. l. 3, c. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Const. Apost. l. 7, c. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Tert. in Marc. c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. annal. ad ann. 80.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. apol. c. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 12.

<sup>8</sup> Idem ib. c. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Epiph. l. 27, c. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Bib. Patr. tom. 7.

<sup>11</sup> Vide Baron. ad ann. 69, et Voss. Hist. Græc. l. 2, c. 9.



Cletus and Anacletus not two, but one pope. How they were first distinguished. Decretals ascribed to him.

## CLETUS, OR ANACLETUS, SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[TITUS, DOMITIAN.]

[Year of Christ 78.] LINUS was succeeded by Cletus, or Anacletus, whom the Greeks constantly style Anencletus, that is, irreprehensible. An opinion has long obtained in the Church of Rome, distinguishing Cletus and Anacletus as two popes, nay, as two saints; the festival of the one being kept on the 26th of April, and that of the other on the 23d of July.<sup>1</sup> But this distinction is now given up by the most learned men of that church, not only as groundless, but as plainly contradicting the most celebrated writers of antiquity, Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Jerom, to whom we may add Caius, a priest of Rome, who, writing in the beginning of the third century, reckoned Victor the thirteenth bishop of that city.<sup>2</sup> Baronius, however, spares no pains to keep up that distinction; but alleges nothing to countenance it, except the poem against Marcion, ascribed to Tertullian, the pontifical of Anastasius, and some martyrologies.<sup>3</sup> Who was the author of that poem is not well known, but all agree that it was not written by Tertullian.<sup>4</sup> Besides, the author, whoever he was, places both Cletus and Anacletus before Clement; which Baronius condemns as a gross mistake. As for the pontifical, the annalist often finds fault with it; and complains, in this very place, that Anastasius's whole chronology is overcast with an impenetrable mist.<sup>5</sup> The martyrologies he quotes are of too modern a date to deserve any regard, since none of them were heard of before the ninth century.<sup>6</sup> But how, says Baronius, was this distinction first introduced? We may, perhaps, account for it thus: Irenæus, with all the Greeks, and St. Jerom, among the Latins, place Anacletus, as we have observed above, before Clement; whereas St. Austin and Optatus Milevitanus place him after. This, and his being called Cletus by Epiphanius, and in several copies of Ruffinus, might induce some to imagine, that as the names and places were different, so were the persons. Thus, as we conjecture, of one pope, two popes were made, two saints, and two martyrs; for, in the canon of the mass, he has a place with Linus among the martyrs; though neither was acknowledged for such by Irenæus, or any of the ancients; nay, Anacletus is said, in some pontificals, to have *died in peace*, that is, according to the phrase of those days, of a natural death.<sup>7</sup> Bollandus, after having much laboured, but

laboured in vain, to maintain the distinction between Cletus and Anacletus, yields at last, and gives up the point. But yet, unwilling to make the least alteration in the catalogue of the popes, which places, with the approbation of the holy see, Clement between Cletus and Anacletus, he strives to save it with a new and pretty extraordinary invention; for he pretends Anacletus or Cletus to have resigned the chair to Clement, and Clement, in his turn, to have yielded it to him again. Thus, according to him, though Cletus and Anacletus are one and the same person, yet no fault is to be found with the catalogue; and Clement is rightly placed both after and before him.<sup>1</sup> This is a speculation of his own, altogether groundless, and therefore not worthy of a place here, were it not to show what low shifts and subterfuges even men of parts, in the Church of Rome, choose to submit to, rather than to yield to reason, in points that seem to derogate from the authority of that see. Anacletus governed the church twelve years, according to Eusebius;<sup>2</sup> to which some add two months, some three, and some only one; so that he must have died in the year 91. He is supposed to have been buried next to St. Peter, in the Vatican, where his supposed body is shown, and worshipped to this day.<sup>3</sup> We find, in the collection of Isidorus Mercator, three decretals, under the name of Cletus; but such decretals as are anterior to the pontificate of Pope Syricius, who was elected in the year 384, are now universally looked upon as bare-faced forgeries.<sup>4, 5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bolland. Pont. p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Bolland. 26 Apr. 410, 411.

<sup>4</sup> Vide Card. Bon. liturg. l. 1, c. 3, et Natal. Alexand. hist. Eccles. p. 743, &c.

<sup>5</sup> All the decretal epistles of the popes, before Syricius, are so filled with absurdities, contradictions, anachronisms, &c., that they are now given up, even by the most sanguine advocates for the papal supremacy. And yet these very decretals, absurd as they are, and inconsistent with themselves, as well as with all the genuine writings of those times, whether sacred or profane, were, for several ages, the main stays of the whole fabric of the papal power. By them that power was established; by them it was supported; for, in the days of ignorance, they were universally received as the genuine writings of the ancient Bishops of Rome, in whose names they were published. And, truly, were we to rank them, as they were ranked in the monkish and ignorant ages, with the decisions of the oecumenical councils, and the canonical books of the Scripture, no room would be left to question any branch of the unlimited power claimed by the popes. They were held in the greatest esteem and veneration from the beginning of the 9th century to the time of the Reformation, when, upon the first dawn of learning, the cheat was discovered, and the stays removed, which till then had supported the unwieldy edifice. But it was then in a condition to stand by itself, at least till new frauds were devised to prop it up; and this was accordingly done, without loss of time.

The decretals of the first popes are quoted by Bellarmine, to prove, that the supremacy of the Bishops of

<sup>1</sup> Martyrol Roman.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 28; Pearson posthum. p. 147, 148.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 69. <sup>4</sup> Halloix in vit. Iren. p. 646.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 69. <sup>6</sup> Bolland. Pont. p. 217.

<sup>7</sup> Vide Pears. posthum. p. 19.



Clement mentioned by St. Paul. Some confound him with Flavins Clemens. Chosen Bishop of Rome.

## CLEMENT, THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[DOMITIAN, NERVA, TRAJAN.]

[Year of Christ 91.] CLEMENT, the successor of Anacletus, is, according to Ori-

Rome was universally acknowledged in the earliest times (Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2, c. 14:) but, at the same time, he owns, that *he dares not affirm them to be of undoubted authority*. And what can be more absurd than to quote a forgery, or what he himself owns may be a forgery, in vindication of so darling a point as *the supremacy*? But he did it for want of better evidences, and must therefore be excused. Baronius, ashamed to lay any stress on such gross and palpable forgeries, contents himself with only saying, that the popes had no hand in forging them; and that they never made use of their authority to support their own. That they were concerned in, or privy to, the forging of those letters, I dare not affirm: but that they countenanced them, as they did all other forgeries tending to the advancement of their see: that they received them as genuine, and endeavoured to impose them upon others; nay, that they made use of them soon after their first appearance in the world, to establish and promote the authority of their see; are undoubted matters of fact: witness the letter, which Nicolas I. wrote, in the year 865, to Hincmarus archbishop of Rheims, and to the other bishops of France, who, refusing to comply with some exorbitant demands of the pope, had rejected the decretals, on which those demands were founded, as writings that had been lately counterfeited. Nicolas, in his answer to them, maintains the authenticity of those letters, exhorts all, who profess the Catholic faith, to receive them *with due veneration*, and claims, in virtue of such sacred and authentic writings, an uncontrolled authority over all the churches of the world, as lodged from the beginning in his see. (Nic. l. ep. 42.) And was not this making use of the supposed authority of those decretals to promote his own? Nicolas seems to have believed the letters to be genuine; and, if he did, he was certainly mistaken, and erred in proposing, as he does, spurious pieces for a *firm and strong foundation* of our belief, as well as our practice. If he did not believe them to be genuine, and yet endeavoured to persuade the bishops of France that they were so; nay, and claimed, upon the authority of such pieces, a power over them, and their churches; a worse epithet would suit him better than that of *fallible*, which is common to all men.

The first who published these decretals was, according to Hincmarus, Riculphus bishop of Mentz, who was supposed to have brought them from Spain; because the name of Isidore was prefixed to the collection, and a famous writer of that name, namely, Isidore, Bishop of Seville, had flourished in Spain some centuries before. But such a mean and scandalous undertaking is altogether unworthy of so great a prelate; and besides, the author of the supposed decretals has copied, *verbatim*, some passages from the council of Toledo in 675, and from the sixth council in 681, whereas Isidore of Seville died in 636. The learned Elies du Pin lays this forgery at the door of some German or Frenchman, the letters being all written in the style of the Germans and French, of the 9th century, and many of them addressed to persons of these two nations. Hincmarus was mistaken, in supposing the forged decretals to have been first published by Riculphus of Mentz; for in some of them are found fragments of the council held at Paris in 829, and he died in 814. They were first ushered into the world, and forged too, in all likelihood, by one Benedict, deacon of the church of Mentz, though, in his Preface to that collection, he would fain make us believe, that Autarius, the successor of Riculphus, found them in the archives of that church, and that they had been placed there by Riculphus, who had brought them from Spain. Autarius, in whose time Benedict published his collection, is thought to have been privy to the imposture. The name of Isidore, which was then very common in Spain, was prefixed to it, to persuade the world, that the decretals were brought from that country, and not forged at Mentz, where they first appeared. However, they were suspected by some, even in that dark age, and absolutely rejected by Hincmarus of Rheims, as writings of no authority. But the popes, whose pretensions they were

gen,<sup>1</sup> Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> and all the ancients, the person whom St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philip-  
pians,<sup>3</sup> names among those who had “laboured with him in the gospel, and whose names were in the book of life.” Hence Chrysostom concludes, that, together with St. Luke and Timothy, he attended the Apostle of the Gentiles in all his journeys.<sup>4</sup> Irenæus assures us, that he had not only seen the apostles and conversed with them, but that, when he was appointed Bishop of Rome, he still heard their voices sounding in his ears, still had before his eyes the rules and good example they had given him.<sup>5</sup> Origen styles him *the disciple of the apostles*;<sup>6</sup> Rufinus, *almost an apostle*;<sup>7</sup> and Clement of Alexandria, *an apostle*.<sup>8</sup> That he was well versed in every branch of learning, especially in polite literature, descended of a senatorian family, and nearly related to the Cæsars, is what we read in Eucherius<sup>9</sup> and Nilus,<sup>10</sup> who seem to have followed therein the Recognitions, a book of no authority. Eucherius perhaps confounded, as others have done, Pope Clement with Flavius Clemens, who was son to Flavius Sabinus, the only brother of Vespasian, and suffered death for the Christian religion in the persecution of Domitian;<sup>11</sup> for Pope Clement was, as himself seems to insinuate, rather of the race of Jacob than of the Cæsars.<sup>12</sup> Upon the death of Anacletus he was unanimously chosen by the people and clergy of Rome to succeed him. He had been named, say some, to that dignity by St. Peter himself, preferably to Linus and Anacletus;<sup>13</sup> but had declined it, finding that the faithful were not all equally disposed to submit to the judgment and authority of St. Peter. He therefore withdrew; and, as he was of a mild and pacific disposition, led a retired life to

calculated to favor, exerting all their authority to bring them into repute, they were in the end universally received, and inserted into all the collections of canons. At present they are so universally exploded, that there is not a single writer, no, not even in the Church of Rome, who is not ashamed to patronize or defend them. But the work is done, for which they were intended; and now that the edifice can stand by itself, no matter what becomes of the stays that supported it when it could not. These decretals may be justly looked upon as a standing monument of the ignorance, superstition, and credulity, that universally prevailed in the church, from the beginning of the ninth century to the time of the Reformation. I shall conclude with observing, that, from these decretals, Anastasius the Bibliothecarian, and after him Platina, have chiefly copied what they relate of the first popes, supposing them to have really done what, in those spurious pieces, they are said to have done.

<sup>1</sup> Origen, in Jo. p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Philip. iv. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. in Phil. hom. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Orig. Pr. in l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195.

<sup>8</sup> Clem. Strom. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Euch. ad Val. p. 19.

<sup>10</sup> Nil. l. 2, ep. 49.

<sup>11</sup> Dio, l. 65; Suet. in Dom. c. 15; Orig. in Cels. l. 1, p. 5.

<sup>12</sup> Clem. ep. 1, c. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Epiph. hær. 27, c. 6.



His famous Epistle to the Corinthians. Unjustly criticised by Photius. Thought lost, but appears again. Clement dies. His fabulous acts. The miracles he wrought unknown to Irenæus

the death of Anacletus, when he was forced to accept of the dignity which he had before declined. Thus Ruffinus, upon the authority of the Recognitions; which appears to me, I must own, a very improbable tale. During his pontificate happened an impious and detestable division, to use his own terms, among the Christians of Corinth, which obliged them to have recourse to other churches, especially to that of Rome; and on this occasion was written that famous Epistle to the Corinthians, so much magnified by the ancients, and publicly read, not only in the Church of Corinth, as Dionysius assures us, who was bishop of that city in 180, but in many other churches, to the time of Eusebius, and St. Jerome,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps long after. It was by some ranked among the canonical books of the Scripture, and by all revered next to them.<sup>2</sup> It was written in the name of the whole Church of Rome, and to the whole Church it is, in express terms, ascribed by Irenæus,<sup>3</sup> and Clement of Alexandria, who calls it the Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians.<sup>4</sup> However, it was composed by Clement, in the name of the church; for, in the primitive times, bishops did nothing by themselves, but every thing jointly with their churches: "We advise," "We exhort," "We recommend," &c., was their usual style; which the popes still observe, though they mean only themselves; for they scorn to join either with the people or clergy. The style of this excellent letter is plain, clear, full of energy, without any useless ornaments; and the whole written with the simplicity, as Photius observes,<sup>5</sup> that the Church requires in ecclesiastical writers. There is so great an affinity, both as to the sense and the words, between this epistle, and the epistle to the Hebrews, that some have concluded Clement to have been the translator, nay, and the author of that epistle.<sup>6</sup> In Clement's epistle Photius discovers, as he thinks, three faults; viz., that he supposes other worlds beyond the ocean; that he speaks of the phoenix as a real bird; and that he uses words expressing the humanity of our Saviour, and not his divinity. But, as to the first of these objections, there can be no difficulty now, that we know for certain, what was but doubtfully advanced by the ancients; in speaking of the phoenix he complies with the opinion universally received in those days by the learned, both among the Christians and pagans. As to the third objection, Photius must not have observed, that he styles our Savior's sufferings, the sufferings of God, which was acknowledging his divinity. This epistle, the most precious and valuable treasure the church can boast, after the Holy Scriptures, was for many ages bewailed as lost; but, in 1633,

it was again restored to the Christian world, by Patricius Junius, a north Briton, who published it from a manuscript, written by an Egyptian lady, named Thecla, about the time of the great Council of Nice, and afterwards brought over into England.<sup>1</sup> That this piece is genuine, appears from a great many passages quoted out of it by the ancients.

The most remarkable event that happened in the pontificate of Clement, was the persecution of Domitian; but what part he bore in it we can learn from no credible author. He died, according to Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> in the third year of Trajan's reign, that is, in the 100th of the Christian era. In the canon of the mass he has a place, with his two predecessors, among the martyrs; but Telesphorus, the seventh Bishop of Rome, is the first, as I have observed above, who was acknowledged as such by Irenæus, whose authority is of far greater weight than that of Ruffinus, or Pope Zosimus, who suppose him to have died for the confession of the faith.<sup>3</sup> In the Acts of Clement, to which Gregory of Tours gave an entire credit,<sup>4</sup> and after him many others, especially the two credulous annalists, Baroni-<sup>5</sup> and Alford,<sup>6</sup> in his Annals of the British Church, we read, that Clement was banished by Trajan into the Chersonesus, beyond the Euxine sea; that there he caused a fountain to spring up miraculously for the relief of the Christians confined to the same inhospitable region; that he converted the whole country to the faith, which provoked the emperor to such a degree, that he ordered him to be thrown into the sea, with an anchor fastened to his neck. It is added, that, on the anniversary of his death, the sea retired to the place where he had been drowned, though three long miles from the shore; that upon its retiring, there appeared a most magnificent temple, all of the finest marble; and in the temple a stately monument, in which was found the body of the saint; that the sea continued thus retiring every year on the same day, not daring, for the space of seven days, to return to its usual bounds, that the Christians might, at their leisure, and without apprehension of danger, perform their devotions in honour of the saint. To crown the whole, they add, that, one year, a mother having heedlessly left her young child in the temple, upon her return, next year, she found it not only alive, but in perfect health.<sup>7</sup> No mention is made of such stupendous miracles by Irenæus, who was brought up under Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna, in Asia, at the very time Clement is supposed to have suffered, and who speaks of him at length. His silence is a plain demonstration that they were unknown to him; and they must have been known, had they been true.

Besides, the letter to the Corinthians, of

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 16; Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Iren. l. 3, c. 3, Euseb. l. 3, c. 16, et l. 4, c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Clem. Strom. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Phot. c. 126.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 38; et l. 6, c. 25; Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Not. Jun. p. 3; Not. Cotel. p. 8. <sup>2</sup> Eus. l. 3, c. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Ruf. Orig. t. 1, p. 778; Concil. per Lab. t. 2, p. 1559.

<sup>4</sup> Greg. Tur. de glor. marty. c. 35. <sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 102.

<sup>6</sup> Alf. ad ann. eund.

<sup>7</sup> Greg. Tur. ib.



Other writings ascribed to Clement. A second letter to the Corinthians. Five other letters. His Itinerary. The Recognitions. St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion. The Apostolic Constitutions. The Canons of the Apostles.

which I have spoken above, several other pieces are ascribed to Clement; namely, a second letter to the Corinthians; which is, without all doubt, very ancient; but Eusebius doubts whether it was written by Clement;<sup>1</sup> and both St. Jerom,<sup>2</sup> and Photius,<sup>3</sup> absolutely reject it. Five other letters, placed among the decretals, whereof the first, more ancient than the rest, was translated by Ruffinus, and is quoted by the Council of Vaison, held in 442.<sup>4</sup> However, it is generally looked upon as a spurious piece; for the author of it, whoever he was, acquaints St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, who died long before St. Peter, with St. Peter's death.<sup>5</sup> Clement's Itinerary, which, in Photius's time, was prefixed, by way of Preface, to the Recognitions.<sup>6</sup> The Recognitions, relating, under the name of Clement, the actions of St. Peter, his Interview with Simon the Magician, how Clement himself knew again his father and his brothers, whom he had forgot; whence the whole work took the name of Recognitions, that is, *of knowing again*: it is likewise called the Itinerary of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Clement.<sup>7</sup> The Recognitions are quoted by Origen,<sup>8</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>9</sup> and Ruffinus,<sup>10</sup> as the work of Clement; but these writers, at the same time, own them to have been altered in several places, and falsified by the heretics; nay, Epiphanius tells us, that the Ebionites scarce left any thing sound in them.<sup>11</sup> The author was well versed in philosophy, mathematics, astrology, and most other sciences, but not so well acquainted with the doctrine of the church; whence his work is absolutely rejected by Athanasius,<sup>12</sup> and now generally looked upon as a piece falsely ascribed to Clement. St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion were probably written in the third century, and, to gain credit, fathered upon Clement; for Eusebius writes, that there had lately appeared a long work, under the name of Clement, containing dialogues between St. Peter and Apion.<sup>13</sup> As to the Apostolic Constitutions, if that work is different from the doctrine of the apostles, mentioned by Athanasius and Eusebius, Epiphanius is the first who speaks of it: it appears, at least, from Dionysius of Alexandria, that, in the year 250, the Constitutions either had not yet appeared, or were of no repute in the church.<sup>14</sup> Epiphanius tells us, that many suspected them; but, as for himself, he received them, since he found nothing in them repugnant to the faith, or the discipline of the church.<sup>15</sup> But as he quotes several passages out of them, which are not to be

found now, we may well conclude, that, since his time, they have been either altered or curtailed. The Greeks, indeed, in the second canon of the Council, that, in 692, was held at Constantinople, in a tower of the imperial palace, called Trullus, that is, the Cupola, declare, that they had been falsified, in several places, by the heretics. Photius thinks that, with respect to the style, they fall short of the Recognitions, but far excel them in the purity of the doctrine, adding, at the same time, that it is no easy task to clear them from the imputation of Arianism.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pearson takes them to be a collection of several pieces, published in the earliest times, under the name of the apostles, and containing, as was pretended, the instructions they had given.<sup>2</sup> Albaspinæus, Bishop of Orange, thinks the matter they contain excellent, and the whole agreeable to the discipline observed by the Greek Church, during the four first centuries; but nevertheless he looks upon them only as a collection of the different customs that were established, by degrees, in the church, and some of which were disputed even in the fourth century;<sup>3</sup> so that they can by no means be ascribed either to the apostles, or to Clement. The Constitutions end with eighty-five canons, long known by the title of The Canons of the Apostles; but, as they contain several things that were not received in the apostles' time, nor in Clement's, the ablest critics are of opinion, that they likewise are but a collection of several decrees made in the first ages of the church, and that they were not collected into one body till the third century.<sup>4</sup> I don't find them quoted before the Council of Constantinople in 394. The Greeks, in the Council of the year 602, mentioned above, bound themselves to the observance of them; but they are all rejected by Pope Gelasius: however, Dionysius Exiguus having, not long after, placed the first fifty at the head of his collection, they were received by degrees; but the other thirty-five have not been admitted to this day.

Upon the whole, of the many writings ascribed to Clement, the first letter to the Corinthians is the only one undoubtedly his: and what a wide difference appears, as to the spirit and style between that excellent piece and the briefs, bulls, mandates, &c., of his successors? He does not command, but exhorts; he does not threaten but entreats; he does not thunder anathemas and excommunications, but employs the most mild and gentle persuasives, even with the authors of the schism. Had he known himself to be the infallible and unerring judge of controversies, from whose tribunal lay no appeal: had the Corinthians believed themselves bound, on pain of damnation, to submit to his decisions, there had been no room

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 38.    <sup>2</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 15.  
<sup>3</sup> Phot. c. 113.    <sup>4</sup> Concil. per Labb. t. 3, p. 1458.  
<sup>5</sup> Vide Blond. Decret. p. 25, 28.  
<sup>6</sup> Phot. c. 113.  
<sup>7</sup> Coteler. not. in script. Apost. p. 353.  
<sup>8</sup> Orig. Philocal. c. 23, p. 81, 82.  
<sup>9</sup> Epiph. hæ. 30, c. 15.  
<sup>10</sup> Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195.    <sup>11</sup> Epiph. hæ. 30, p. 65.  
<sup>12</sup> Athan. sym. p. 154.    <sup>13</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 38.  
<sup>14</sup> Ign. prol. c. 8, p. 54.    <sup>15</sup> Epiph. hæ. 76, p. 822.

<sup>1</sup> Phot. c. 113.    <sup>2</sup> Pears. in Ign. t. 1, p. 60, 61.  
<sup>3</sup> Alb. obser. l. 1, c. 3, p. 37, 38.  
<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. et Ign. prol. c. 15, p. 103.



Clement's Infallibility unknown to him, and to the Corinthians. Evaristus governs nine years. Alexander not a Martyr. The Institution of Holy Water falsely ascribed to him.

for reasons, arguments, and persuasives; he ought to have exerted the power with which he was vested, and put an end to all disputes, in the peremptory style of his successors, "We declare, and command all men to comply with this our declaration, on pain of incurring the indignation of the Almighty; and," as if that were not enough, "of his

blessed apostles Peter and Paul." But it was not till some ages after, that the popes found out their infallibility, or rather their flattering divines found it out for them; so that this invaluable privilege lying dormant, men were obliged, for a long time, to make use of their reason, in deciding religious controversies.

## EVARISTUS, FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TRAJAN.]

[Year of Christ 100.] CLEMENT was succeeded by Evaristus, Evaristes, or Aristus, as he is called in the most ancient catalogue of the popes,<sup>1</sup> in the third year of Trajan's reign, that is, in the close of the first century of the Christian era. He governed about nine years, that is, to the twelfth year of Trajan, and the 109th of Christ.<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, in his Chronicle, supposes him to have died in the year 107;<sup>3</sup> and, in his history, says, that his death happened about the year 109;<sup>4</sup> but, in the series and succession of the popes, that writer is every where consistent with himself in his history, and quite otherwise in his Chronicle. Besides, the history ought to cor-

rect the Chronicle, as being posterior to it. To Evaristus are ascribed two decretals, the distribution of the titles or parishes of Rome, on which Baronius makes a long descant,<sup>1</sup> and an order, that bishops, when they preached, should be always attended by seven deacons.<sup>2</sup> But these and many other things of the same nature, we read only in Baronius, Platina, Anastasius, Ciaconius, &c., and my design is, as I have declared in the preface, to follow the ancients alone, in the history of the ancient popes; and therefore I shall take no notice of what the moderns advance, unless I find it supported by the authority of the original writers.

## ALEXANDER, FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TRAJAN, ADRIAN.]

[Year of Christ 109.] SIXTUS is placed, by Optatus Milevitanus,<sup>5</sup> immediately after Evaristus; but that is certainly a mistake, owing, in all likelihood, to those who transcribed him, since Irenæus,<sup>6</sup> Eusebius,<sup>7</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>8</sup> and even St. Augustin,<sup>9</sup> who follows Optatus in every thing else relating to the popes, place Alexander between Evaristus and Sixtus. Irenæus reckons Alexander the fifth Bishop of Rome; so that we agree with the most authentic and unexceptionable writer of antiquity in excluding St. Peter, and supposing Cletus and Anacletus to be one and the same person.<sup>10</sup> Alexander governed ten years and some months; and died in the third year of Adrian, and 119 of Christ.<sup>11</sup> We can learn nothing of the ancients concerning him: he is worshipped indeed by the Church of Rome as a martyr; but that title is not given him by Irenæus: and as for the Venerable Bede, who ranks him among the martyrs,

he was led into that mistake by the Acts of St. Alexander, which, in the opinion of Dr. Pearson, were composed in the seventh century, but are now universally rejected as fabulous. Platina ascribes to Pope Alexander the institution of holy water,<sup>3</sup> which Baronius takes very much amiss of him, since he thereby robs the apostles of an honour due to them; for by the apostles, in his opinion, was first introduced the use of holy water.<sup>4</sup> But if we trace up this holy water to the fountain head, we shall find that it arises from an unhallowed spring, from the lustral water of the Pagans; for peace being restored to the church by Constantine, the Christians began, as a modern writer well observes,<sup>5</sup> to adopt the ceremonies of the Gentiles. Several cities in Italy, France, Germany, Spain, &c., pretend to have relics of this pope, insomuch that, were they all put together, they would form at least twenty entire bodies.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 270.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. chron. l. 4, c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. ep. 165.

<sup>6</sup> Idem, l. 4, c. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 34.

<sup>8</sup> Idem, l. 3, c. 34.

<sup>9</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Epiph. hær. 27, c. 6.

<sup>11</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ann. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Idem, ann. 121.

<sup>3</sup> Platin. in ej. vit.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 132, N. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Le Sueur, hist. de l'Egl. et de l'Emp. ad ann. 108.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. Bolland. 3 Maii, p. 370, et Baillet vies de Saints, 3 de Mai.



Decretals also ascribed to Sixtus. His Reliques. Telesphorus the first Bishop of Rome, Martyr. The two heretics, Valentine and Cerdo, come to Rome.

## SIXTUS, SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ADRIAN.]

[Year of Christ 119.] THE successor of Alexander is named Sixtus by Optatus<sup>1</sup> and St. Augustin;<sup>2</sup> but by Irenæus,<sup>3</sup> Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>5</sup> and Jerom,<sup>6</sup> Xystus: which word has some signification annexed to it in Greek; whereas Sixtus has none either in Greek or Latin. He presided ten years according to Eusebius,<sup>7</sup> but not complete; for he was raised to the see in the third year of Adrian, of Christ 119, and died in the twelfth year of the same prince, about the latter end of the year of Christ 128.<sup>8</sup> He is ranked among the martyrs in the Canon of the Mass, and in all the martyrologies: but his immediate successor is the first to whom that title is given by Irenæus. To Sixtus are ascribed two decretals, but both forged in latter ages,

as plainly appears from De Marca, from Baluzius, and, above all, from the haughty title of Universal Bishop, which Sixtus is made to assume in one of them: a title, as F. Pagi is forced to confess, unknown to the bishops of the primitive and best times.<sup>1</sup> The title of Universal would be better adapted to the relics of this pope, than to his episcopacy; for they are dispersed all over the Roman Catholic world: but Baillet himself looks upon them as false, and unworthy of the worship that is paid to them, not excepting even those that were given by Clement X. to Cardinal de Retz, who caused them to be placed with great solemnity in the Abbey of St. Michael in Lorrain.<sup>2</sup>

## TELESPHORUS, SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ADRIAN, ANTONINUS PIUS.]

[Year of Christ 128.] SIXTUS was succeeded by Telesphorus (or, as some style him, Thelesphorus,) the seventh Bishop of the see of Rome.<sup>9</sup> To him is ascribed, in some editions of the Chronicle of Eusebius, the institution of Lent;<sup>10</sup> but in none of the best editions mention is made of such an institution, and scarce in any manuscripts.<sup>11</sup> Baronius endeavours to prove, that this fast was instituted by the apostles, and that Telesphorus established it for ever by a decree; but his arguments are so weak that he

deserves rather to be pitied than answered. He introduces too early the Bishops of Rome issuing decrees, and prescribing laws to the whole church. Telesphorus was the first Bishop of Rome who suffered death for the Christian religion, seeing Irenæus distinguishes him with the title of Martyr,<sup>3</sup> which this author gives to none of his predecessors; but, as to the particulars of his death, the ancients have left us quite in the dark. He suffered in the eleventh year of his pontificate, the first of Antoninus Pius, and 139 of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

## HYGINUS, EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANTONINUS PIUS.]

[Year of Christ 139.] HYGINUS, the successor of Telesphorus, governed the church but four years, and those not complete; for, in 142, we find Pius already in that see.<sup>12</sup> In his time the two famous heretics, Valen-

tine and Cerdo, came to Rome; the former from Egypt, and the latter from Syria, to display their new doctrine in that great metropolis. Hyginus no doubt opposed them with all the zeal of a primitive bishop; but, in spite of his zeal, they gained a great many proselytes to their heterodox opinions.<sup>5</sup> His infallibility, had it been then known and

<sup>1</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ep. 53.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Epiph. hæ. 97, c. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. chron.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. l. 4 c. 4, & 5.

<sup>9</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3; Euseb. l. 4, c. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Bar. ad ann. 154.

<sup>11</sup> Not. Scal. in chron. 216; Not. Pont. in chron. p. 612.

<sup>12</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 11

<sup>1</sup> Pagi in vit. Sixt.

<sup>2</sup> Baill. ib. 6 d'Avril.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 4; Philas. c. 44; Epiph. hæ. 41, c. 1.



Marcion comes to Rome. The power of receiving Appeals disowned by the Church of Rome. Pius no Martyr. Writings ascribed to him.

believed, would have soon put a stop to the growing evil. The church of Rome honours Hyginus among her martyrs; but none of the ancients give him that title. To him is ascribed the use of god-fathers and god-mothers in baptism, and the ceremony of consecrating churches; but upon no better

grounds than the two decretals are fathered upon him, which are, by all the learned, rejected as spurious. Hyginus died in the year 142, the fourth or fifth of Antoninus Pius; and is supposed to have been buried near St. Peter.<sup>1</sup>

## PIUS, NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANTONINUS PIUS.]

[Year of Christ 142.] ANICETUS is placed next to Hyginus by Optatus,<sup>1</sup> St. Augustin,<sup>2</sup> and Epiphanius.<sup>3</sup> But who would not, with Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> rather follow Irenæus,<sup>5</sup> and Hege-sippus,<sup>6</sup> naming Pius<sup>7</sup> immediately after Hyginus, since the former wrote in the time of Eleutherius the second bishop after Anicetus; and the latter lived at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and continued there till the pontificate of Eleutherius.

In the time of Pius, Marcion, a native of Pontus, and the son of a bishop of the holy Catholic Church, says Epiphanius,<sup>8</sup> being excommunicated by his father for debauching a virgin, and finding he could by no means prevail upon the venerable prelate to receive him again into the church, abandoned his native city, supposed to be Sinope, and fled to Rome. Upon his arrival there, he applied to the elders of that church, entreating them to admit him to their communion. But those holy men, who had been taught by the disciples of the apostles, instead of complying with his request, returned him this answer: "We cannot admit you without leave from your holy father; nor can we, as we are all united in the same faith, and the same sentiments, undo what our holy colleague your father has done." Thus Epiphanius.<sup>8</sup> Had Bellarmine lived in those days, he had taught them another doctrine, a doctrine which, however necessary, the apostles had forgot to deliver to their disciples, viz., That the see of Rome was raised above all other sees; that the appeals of the whole catholic church were to be brought to it; that no appeals were to be made from it; that it was to judge of the whole church, but be judged by none. Marcion did not apply to Pius, as the reader must have observed, or at least did not apply to him alone, but to the elders, who disclaimed all power of reversing the sentence of a particular bishop or judge. And is not this an evident and incontestable proof that the power of receiving appeals was not known, or thought of, in those days? And yet, who

would believe it? Bellarmine has the assurance to allege this very case as an argument to prove in the pope a power of receiving appeals.<sup>2</sup> But what would become of this prerogative, should the pope return the same answer to every appellant?

Pius governed the church for the space of fifteen years, and died in 157, the twentieth of Antoninus.<sup>3</sup> The Roman martyrology tells us, that he was martyred in the persecution of Antoninus Pius; but in that prince's reign there was no persecution; nor is the title of martyr given him by Irenæus. Baronius ascribes to this pope a decree, commanding the festival of Easter to be kept on Sunday, and quotes the Chronicle of Eusebius.<sup>4</sup> This decree is indeed mentioned in some editions of that writer; but Scaliger assures us, that no mention is made of it in any manuscript copy; and therefore he has left it out in his edition.<sup>5</sup> As to the celebration of Easter, it is manifest from Irenæus that though Pius, as well as his predecessors Sixtus, Telesphorus and Hyginus, differed from the bishops of Asia, yet they did not on that account separate themselves from their communion.<sup>6</sup> On this pope are fathered several spurious pieces, namely, some decrees, two letters ranked among the decretals, and two more written to Justus bishop of Vienne, in Dauphiné. The decrees, as well as the decretals, are universally rejected; and yet F. Pagi quotes one of them to prove the real presence in the sacrament.<sup>7</sup> The two letters to Justus are deemed genuine by Baronius,<sup>8</sup> by Cardinal Bona,<sup>9</sup> and by Blondel in his Treatise of the Sybils,<sup>10</sup> who nevertheless suspects them elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, they are absolutely rejected as false by Dr. Pearson,<sup>12</sup> by Cotelerius,<sup>13</sup> and Natalis Alexander,<sup>14</sup> who discover several expressions in them that were not in use till some ages after, and a great many incohe-

<sup>1</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Epiph. hæ. 42.

<sup>3</sup> Ien. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Epiph. hæ. 42, c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. ep. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Apud. Euseb. l. 4, c. 22.

<sup>8</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Bolland. April. p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. chron. not. Scal. p. 119.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 166.

<sup>6</sup> Blond. l. 2, c. 6.

<sup>7</sup> Pears. in Ign. l. 2, p. 170.

<sup>8</sup> Cotel. not. in script. Apost. p. 42, 43.

<sup>9</sup> Nat. Alex. t. 1, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> Bell. l. 2, c. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 159.

<sup>4</sup> Pagi in Pio, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Bona rer. liturgic. l. 1, c. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Idem de la primauté.



St. Polycarp comes to Rome, and reclaims many from the errors of Marcion. Anicetus and he disagree about the celebration of Easter, but part without breach of charity. Hegesippus and St. Justin at Rome.

rencies. To say with Le Sueur, that they were written originally in Greek, and in latter times translated into Latin,<sup>1</sup> is but a poor evasion. As for the fable of Hermes, the brother of Pius, who, by the command of an

angel appearing to him in the disguise of a shepherd, is said to have written a book showing that Easter ought to be kept on Sunday, I refer the reader to Platina, and such-like writers.

## ANICETUS, TENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANTONINUS, M. AURELIUS.]

[Year of Christ 157.] Pius was succeeded by Anicetus, in whose time Valentine the heretic, who came to Rome in the pontificate of Hyginus, and had gained many proselytes under Pius, continued sowing his pestilential errors among the members of that church: but many whom he had seduced were reclaimed by St. Polycarp, formerly the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and then Bishop of Smyrna. His declaring to them, that the doctrine taught by the church was the doctrine he had learnt of the apostles, made such an impression on their minds, that they abjured the errors of Valentine, and returned to the communion of the faithful.<sup>2</sup> They preferred the bare word of Polycarp, who claimed no infallibility, to the infallible authority of Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus. This is a plain proof that the popes had not yet begun to exert their infallibility; or, if they had, that it was not acknowledged. What brought St. Polycarp to Rome was the controversy about the celebration of Easter, which at this time began to grow very warm between the eastern and western churches.<sup>3</sup> All the churches of the east, and amongst the rest that of Smyrna, kept Easter on the 14th day of the moon of the first month, in conformity to the custom of the Jews: on the other hand, Anicetus would neither conform to that custom himself, nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the 14th of the moon. That this dispute might not occasion a schism in the church, Polycarp undertook a journey to Rome, in order to confer with the bishop of that city, who was the chief opposer of the Quartodecimans.<sup>4</sup> But it happened in this, as it does in most religious disputes, they parted each retaining his own way of thinking; but, at the same time, what happens but seldom, without the least breach of that charity which is the great and fundamental law of our holy religion. In token whereof they communicated together at the holy sacrament; nay, Anicetus, out of respect to St. Polycarp, yielded to him the eucharist;<sup>5</sup> that is, gave

him leave to consecrate the eucharist in his own church: after which they parted in peace, though both determined to follow the ancient practice of their respective churches;<sup>1</sup> St. Polycarp, though well acquainted with the doctrine of the apostles, was a stranger, it seems, to that of Bellarmine, Baronius, &c., viz., that the whole Catholic Church is bound to conform to the rites, ceremonies, and customs of the Church of Rome.

In the time of Anicetus, Hegesippus and the celebrated martyr St. Justin came to Rome, upon what occasion is uncertain. The former, continuing there to the pontificate of Eleutherius, wrote a book on the doctrine which in that church had been conveyed down from the apostles to Anicetus, and was still observed, says he, in all its original purity.<sup>2</sup> The latter opposed with great zeal Marcion and his followers, publishing a book against his pernicious tenets, and against heresies in general.<sup>3</sup> It was at Rome that he had frequent conferences with Crescens, the Cynic, a man of some note at that time; but, according to the genius of his sect, proud, surly, conceited, and a declared enemy to all who professed the Christian religion, which he painted in the blackest colours.<sup>4</sup> The malice of this Cynic procured in the end for our zealous and learned apologist what he had long and most ardently wished, the glory of sealing with his blood the truth which he had so strenuously defended and promoted with his pen.<sup>5</sup> He suffered under Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus about the year 167, towards the end of the pontificate of Anicetus.

To this pope are ascribed by Anastasius, Platina, Ciaconius, and other modern writers, several ordinances and decrees; but as they are not mentioned by any of the ancients, we do not think them worthy of our notice. Anicetus governed the church, according to Eusebius,<sup>6</sup> eleven years, from the year 157 to the eighth year of M. Aurelius, that is, to 168 of the Christian era. Raban, Florus, and Anastasius, suppose him to have died for the pro-

<sup>1</sup> Sueur, hist. de l'Egl. &c. ad ann. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3, & l. 1, c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Iren. apud Euseb. l. iv. c. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 24.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Just. Apol. 2, p. 70

<sup>4</sup> Tatian. orat. cont. Græc. p. 160.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 16; Epiph. hæc. 46, c. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 19.



Anicetus not a Martyr. His relics. Soter's charities to the distressed Christians. The heresy of Montanus broached in his time. He did not die a Martyr.

fession of the faith; which was, it seems, unknown to Irenæus. He was buried, according to some, near St. Peter, in the Vatican; according to others, in the burying-place of Calixtus;<sup>1</sup> out of which, though it is uncertain whether he was buried there or not, his head was taken in 1590, and given by Urban VII. to the Jesuits of Munich, in Bavaria, where it is yearly, with great solemnity, exposed to public adoration on the 17th

of April, the anniversary, as is supposed, of his death: his body was taken out of the same place in 1604, and given by Clement VIII. to the Duke of Altaemps, who caused it to be conveyed to the chapel of his palace in Rome, and to be deposited there in a marble tomb, formerly the tomb of the Emperor Alexander; where it is worshipped to this day.

## SOTER, ELEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[M. AURELIUS.]

[Year of Christ 168.] SOTER, the successor of Anicetus, is highly commended on account of his extensive charity towards the poor of other churches, but more especially towards those who were condemned for the confession of their faith to work in the mines.<sup>2</sup> These he is said not only to have relieved in their distress with generous gatherings made for that purpose at Rome, wherein he followed the example of his predecessors, but moreover to have sent letters to them in their afflicted condition. This we learn from a letter of Dionysius, then Bishop of Corinth, which was an answer to a letter from Soter, and the Church of Rome. Dionysius returns thanks to the Romans, and their bishop, for their generosity to the poor of Corinth; acquaints Soter that his letter had been publicly read; adds, that he shall cause it to be read for the future; and closes his epistle with great encomiums on the Romans, who had so generously contributed to the support of the indigent Corinthians.<sup>3</sup> This laudable custom did not end with the second century of the church; for Dionysius of Alexandria, writing about the year 254, to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, says, that all Syria and Arabia felt the good effects of the generosity of the Romans.<sup>4</sup> And some years after, that is, about the year 260, Pope Dionysius being informed, that the city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia had been ruined by the wars, and many Christians carried into captivity, he sent large sums to ransom them, with a letter to the Church of Cæsarea, which was still read in

St. Basil's time.<sup>1</sup> Eusebius tells us, that this custom continued till the last persecution.<sup>2</sup> How differently the immense revenues of the see of Rome are employed now, those know who have seen the extravagant pomp, luxury, and parade of that court. In the year 171, the fourth of Soter, was broached the heresy of the Montanists, so called from their ringleader Montanus.<sup>3</sup> Against these, Soter is said, by an anonymous writer of some antiquity, to have composed a book, which was answered, according to the same writer, by Tertullian, become the defender of that sect:<sup>4</sup> but, according to the best chronologists, Tertullian did not turn Montanist till many years after the death of Soter; and, besides, both Soter's book, and Tertullian's answer to it, were quite unknown to Eusebius, and even to St. Jerom, who took great delight in reading Tertullian. Soter presided eight years, according to Eusebius;<sup>5</sup> that is, from the year 168, to 176, or to the beginning of 177, the 17th year of the reign of M. Aurelius. The title of martyr is given him by the modern writers, but not by Irenæus, or any of the ancients. To him are falsely ascribed two epistles, which have been placed among the Decretals. Where he was buried is uncertain; but his body is worshipped, at present, in the church of St. Sylvester at Rome, and in the cathedral of Toledo in Spain.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vide Bolland. April 17 & 22.  
<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 23.  
<sup>4</sup> Idem, l. 7, c. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Basil. ep. 220.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. chron.

<sup>4</sup> Auct. anonym. de hæres. a Sirmund. edit. hæ. 26, 86, p. 28, 79.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. 5, p. 153.

<sup>6</sup> Bar. in martyrol. 22 April. et Bolland. ad eund. diem.



The martyrs of Lyons write to Eleutherius. Eleutherius did not approve the prophecies of Montanus. Councils held without consulting the Bishop of Rome. Florinus and Blastus's new doctrine.

## ELEUTHERIUS, TWELFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[M. AURELIUS, COMMODUS.]

[Year of Christ 176.] ELEUTHERIUS was deacon of the church of Rome in 168, when Hegesippus came to that city;<sup>1</sup> but Soter, the successor of Anicetus, being dead, he was chosen to govern the church in his room.<sup>2</sup> It is certain, that his election was known in Gaul before the death of the martyrs of Lyons, so famous in ecclesiastical history; for the controversy, which had been raised some years before in the churches of Asia, by Montanus and his followers, concerning the prophetic spirit to which they pretended, making at that time a great noise in the church, the martyrs of Lyons, desirous to contribute, so far as in them lay, to the public peace, wrote letters from their prisons, to the churches of Asia, and likewise to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, declaring their judgment and opinion in the case:<sup>3</sup> for great honor was paid, in those times, to the martyrs, and their opinion was always received with esteem and veneration. It were much to be wished, that Eusebius had set down their opinion at length; but he contents himself only with saying, that it was entirely agreeable to true piety, and to the orthodox faith;<sup>4</sup> which, in my opinion, is enough to make us reject the notion of Dr. Pearson, who takes it for granted, that they wrote in favor of those fanatics, and that for no other reason but because they are said, by Eusebius, to have written for the peace of the church.<sup>5</sup> Was the admitting of false prophets, and false prophecies, giving peace to the church? The same writer adds, that Eleutherius was induced, by the reverence and regard he had for the holy martyrs, to receive the prophecies of Montanus, and his two prophetesses.<sup>6</sup> But herein I must beg leave to disagree with that learned writer, and likewise with Dr. Cave;<sup>7</sup> for it was not, in my opinion, Eleutherius, but his successor Victor, who received the prophecies of Montanus. Tertullian, the only author who informs us that the dreams of that enthusiast were approved by the Bishop of Rome, does not distinguish that bishop by his name; so that he is to be found out only by reasoning and chronology. Now, on one hand, we read in Tertullian, that Montanus had been opposed by the predecessors of the bishop, who embraced his opinions;<sup>8</sup> and, on the other, in Eusebius,<sup>9</sup> that the heresy of Montanus was first broached in the year 171, the eleventh of the reign of M. Aurelius,

and the fourth of the pontificate of Soter, the immediate predecessor of Eleutherius; these two therefore, and these alone, were the bishops who could oppose Montanus; and, since the first broaching of that heresy, the only predecessors of the bishop who embraced it. Victor, the successor of Eleutherius, was greatly provoked against the Asiatic bishops, on account of their refusing to comply with the custom of the church of Rome, in the celebration of Easter; and therefore might, out of spite to them, approve of the opinions which they had condemned: for Montanus, and his followers, had been already condemned, as Eusebius informs us,<sup>1</sup> by several synods held in Asia Minor. No opinion is now deemed heretical, unless condemned by the Bishop of Rome, who claims that prerogative as peculiar to himself; but the synods of Asia, the first mentioned in history, after that of the apostles at Jerusalem, condemned the opinions of Montanus, and cut him off from their communion, without consulting or even acquainting therewith the Bishop of Rome. But, to return to the martyrs; some are of opinion that they condemned, in their letters, the tenets of Montanus and his followers; but, at the same time, wrote in their favour, so far as to entreat the bishops of Asia, and Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, to treat them with indulgence, and admit them upon repentance, to their communion.<sup>2</sup> This is but a bare conjecture, not authorized by any of the ancients; and we do not find that the Montanists ever showed the least inclination to return to the communion of the church.

It was in the pontificate of Eleutherius, that Florinus and Blastus first broached their new doctrine; which was readily embraced by many at Rome; for they were both presbyters of that church.<sup>3</sup> Florinus was first one of the emperor's officers in Asia, afterwards the disciple of St. Polycarp, then famous all over that province; and, lastly, presbyter of the church of Rome; but both he and Blastus were degraded on account of their heretical opinions, and cut off from the communion of the faithful.<sup>4</sup> Against Florinus, Irenæus, then Bishop of Lyons, wrote a letter, entitled, *Of monarchy, or that God is not the author of evil*;<sup>5</sup> and another piece called, *De Ogdoede*, that is, of the eight; meaning, perhaps, the Eight Eons, or persons that composed the chimerical divinity of the Valentinians; for Florinus fell at last into that

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 4, c. 22; Hier. vir. ill. c. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Pears. post, p. 255.

<sup>6</sup> Idem, ib.

<sup>7</sup> Cave, Lives of the Fathers, p. 164.

<sup>8</sup> Tert. in Prax. c. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Euseb. in chron.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 16; Con. per Labb. t. 1, p. 599.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Dupin. Biblioth. p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. c. 15, 20.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib.



The conversion of Lucius, a British king. The whole account fabulous. Several monkish fables concerning King Lucius

heresy.<sup>1</sup> Against Blastus, whom Pacian surnames *the Greek*,<sup>2</sup> Irenæus wrote a book, entitled, *Of schism*.<sup>3</sup> Ado<sup>4</sup> and Bede<sup>5</sup> tell us, that Eleutherius issued a decree, ordaining Easter to be kept on the Sunday after the 14th of the first moon; but as no mention is made of such a decree, by any writer of those times, their authority is of no weight.

Lucius, a British king, is said, by Bede, to have written to Pope Eleutherius, entreating him to send a proper person into Britain, to instruct him in the mysteries of the Christian religion; which the pope readily granted.<sup>6</sup> But as this is vouched only by Bede, who lived many ages after him, and by a Pontifical, supposed to have been written about the middle of the sixth century, what credit the whole history of Lucius may deserve, I leave the reader to judge. Such a remarkable event could not have escaped Eusebius, who, speaking of this very period of time, tells us, that, at Rome, many persons, eminent for their birth and wealth, embraced the Christian religion, with their whole families.<sup>7</sup> A solemn embassy from a British king, and his conversion, surely deserved a place in the history of the church. He informs us, that, in the reign of Commodus, and the Pontificate of Eleutherius, the Christian religion enjoyed a profound tranquillity all over the world; that it flourished, and attracted, to use his expression, the minds of many people.<sup>8</sup> Had he not here a favourable opportunity of mentioning our royal proselyte, who, in the reign of Commodus, is supposed to have written to Eleutherius, and by his means to have been converted to the Christian religion? To what can we ascribe the silence of such an exact and accurate writer, concerning an event which would have greatly recommended both his history, and the Christian religion? To an invincible antipathy, says the Jesuit Alford,<sup>9</sup> which he bore to the name of Britain; and which was so prevalent in him, that he chose rather to suppress the conversion of Lucius than mention it. But what could thus set Eusebius against Britain? Had he been ever injured by the Britons? Does he not elsewhere mention both them and their country? This jesuitical, absurd, and groundless speculation, which must expose the author of it to the ridicule of every reader, I should perhaps have let pass unobserved, had he not in this very place insulted, beyond the bounds common decency, the reformers of religion, for rejecting some idle ceremonies, which he supposes to have been practised at the conversion of Lucius. But, not to lay the whole stress on the silence of Eusebius, and other ancient writers, to whom King Lucius was utterly unknown, why should he have been at the trouble of sending to Rome for an

instructor? Were there not many in his own kingdom as capable of instructing him as any Rome could send? The Christian religion had been planted in this island long before the reign of Lucius, in the time of the apostles, as Gildas seems to insinuate,<sup>1</sup> at least very early in the second century; for Origen, who flourished in the beginning of the third, tells us, that the virtue of the name of Jesus had passed the seas, to find out the Britons in another world.<sup>2</sup>

The short account, which Bede gives us of the embassy and conversion of King Lucius, has not only been greedily swallowed by the monkish writers, who came after him, but has served as a ground-plot to the innumerable fables with which they have filled this part of their histories. They even tell us the names of the ambassadors sent by Lucius to the pope, and of the legates *a Latere* sent by the pope to Lucius. The former were Elvanus and Medwinus, who, being ordained bishops by Eleutherius, returned to Britain, and greatly contributed to the conversion of this island. These fables gained credit, by degrees, in those ages of ignorance and superstition, insomuch that the two ambassadors were at last ranked among the saints; and their bodies, where or when found, nobody knows, exposed to public veneration, in the monastery of Glasenbury, on the 1st of January.<sup>3</sup> The pope's legates were Fugacius and Damianus, who, as we are told, went back to Rome, to obtain of Eleutherius a confirmation of what they had done; and, from Rome, returned into Britain, with a letter from the pope to King Lucius.<sup>4</sup> As for the king himself, he is said to have quitted his kingdom, and, turning missionary, to have preached the gospel in Germany, especially at Ausburgh; to have travelled from thence into the country of the Grisons; and, lastly, to have been ordained Bishop of Coire, their metropolis; and to have died there a martyr.<sup>5</sup> To these monkish fables, King Lucius owes a place among the saints; for on the 3d of December is kept, in the church of Rome, the festival of Lucius, king of the Britons, who died at Coire in Germany:<sup>6</sup> these are the words of the Roman martyrology; but Bede does not so much as mention him in his; a plain proof, that what is said of his preaching, of his martyrdom, &c., was invented after that writer's time. And yet Alford has not only filled his annals with these, and suchlike fabulous accounts, giving an entire credit to them, but inveighs, with great acrimony, against those who have not the gift of belief in the same degree with himself, especially against Dempster, telling him, that till his time the conversion of Lucius had never been

<sup>1</sup> Fleuri hist. Eccles. l. 3, c. 26, 27, p. 395, 397.

<sup>2</sup> Pacian. ep. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Ado ad ann. 194.

<sup>5</sup> Bed. chron. t. 2, p. 111.

<sup>6</sup> Bed. hist. l. 1, c. 4, et chron. t. 2, p. 111.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 21.

<sup>8</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>9</sup> Annal. ad ann. 182, p. 140.

<sup>1</sup> Gild. ex. c. 6, p. 116.

<sup>2</sup> Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Ush. Brit. eccles. antiq. c. 4, et Bolland. 1 Jan.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 183; Bolland. 26 Maii; Ush. ib. p. 54, 102.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Ush. ib. p. 137, 138.

<sup>6</sup> Martyr. Rom. 3 Decem.



The heresy of Theodotus. Victor approves the prophetic spirit of Montanus. His infallibility, how defended by Baronius and Bellarmine.

questioned by any man of sense or learning.<sup>1</sup> And truly, the story of King Lucius has been credited even by the greater part of Protestant writers, out of respect to our venerable historian; but as he wrote many ages after the pretended conversion of that prince, and none of the writers of those days, whom such a remarkable event could hardly have escaped, give us the least hint of it, we may be well allowed to question the whole, notwithstanding the authority of Bede, which can be of no weight with respect to transactions that are said to have happened in times so remote.

Eleutherius governed, according to the best chronologers, fifteen years; and died in 192, the last of the emperor Commodus.<sup>2</sup> To him are ascribed a Decretal, addressed to the bishops of Gaul, and a decree, declaring against Montanus, and his followers, that no

food was forbidden to the Christians; but both are deemed spurious. He was buried, according to some, in the Salarian Way, according to others, in the Vatican; but, in what place soever he was buried, his body is now worshipped in the Vatican at Rome, in the cathedral of Troia in Apulia, and in several other places.<sup>1</sup> The title of Martyr is given him by the Church of Rome, but not by any of the ancient writers. Under him flourished Hegesippus, who wrote, in five books, an account of what had happened in the church since our Saviour's death, to his time.<sup>2</sup> He came to Rome in the pontificate of Anicetus, who was chosen in 157, and, remaining there to the time of Eleutherius, who succeeded Anicetus and Soter in 177, he wrote a book on the doctrine received by tradition in that church;<sup>3</sup> but neither of these works has reached our times.

## VICTOR, THIRTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[COMMODOUS, PERTINAX, SEVERUS.]

[Year of Christ 192.] VICTOR, the successor of Eleutherius, is counted by a writer, who at this very time lived in Rome, the thirteenth bishop of that city:<sup>3</sup> so that neither is St. Peter reckoned among them, nor is Cletus distinguished from Anacletus. In Victor's time a new heresy was broached at Rome by one Theodotus of Byzantium, denying the divinity of Christ.<sup>4</sup> The Theodotians gave out, that Victor favoured their doctrine;<sup>5</sup> which he did, perhaps, at that time;<sup>6</sup> though he cut them off afterwards from his communion. Be that as it will, he can by no means be cleared from another imputation, namely, that of owning and approving the prophetic spirit of Montanus, and his two prophetesses, Prisca and Maximilla: for Tertullian, his contemporary, tells us, in express terms, that he received their prophecies; that, upon receiving them, he gave letters of peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia; but that one Praxeas, just come from those parts, giving him a false account of those prophets, and their churches, and remonstrating, that by approving them, he condemned his predecessors, prevailed upon him to revoke the letters which he had already written in their behalf. Thus Tertullian, who was then himself become a follower of Montanus.<sup>7</sup> Here Baronius and Bellarmine, the two great advocates for the

pope's infallibility, are put to a stand; they own, and cannot help owning, that the pope was deceived, and imposed upon; but, for all that, will not give up his infallibility. How great is the power of prejudice and prepossession! They find the pope actually erring, and yet maintain, that he cannot err. But this apostasy from common sense, if I may be allowed the expression, is not, perhaps, so much owing to prejudice, as to something worse; for no prejudice, however prevalent, can withstand the indisputable evidence of plain matters of fact. It is no new thing, says Baronius, nor what ought to cause in us the least surprise, that a pope should be overreached by impostors.<sup>4</sup> A pope overreached in matters of faith! What then becomes of infallibility? or what is the use of it? But the Montanists, says Bellarmine,<sup>5</sup> craftily concealed from the pope what was erroneous and heretical in their prophecies; so that he, discovering nothing in their doctrine repugnant to that of the church, believed they had been unjustly accused to, and condemned by, his predecessors. But, in the first place, Tertullian tells us, in express terms, that the prophecies of Montanus, and his followers, were approved by the pope; whereas the prophecies, which he is supposed by Bellarmine to have approved, were not the prophecies of Montanus, but others, quite different, and in every respect orthodox. In the second place, if Victor

<sup>1</sup> Alf. ad ann. 201, p. 201.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. chron. Florent. p. 811.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Euseb. l. 5, c. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Epiph. hæc. 54, c. 1; Euseb. l. v. c. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. ib.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. in Prax. c. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Bolland. 26 Maii, p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. et Euseb. l. 4, c. 11, 22.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 173, n. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Bell. de sum. Pont. l. 4, c. 8.



The famous controversy about the celebration of Easter. Victor's haughty conduct. Is opposed by the Bishop of Ephesus, and by a council of all the bishops of Asia Minor. He cuts them off from his communion, &c.

believed that the Montanists had been unjustly condemned by his predecessors, he did not believe them infallible; so that, in every light, this fact oversets the pretended infallibility. We may add, that, if the pope's infallibility depends upon a right information, and neither he nor we can know whether he has been rightly informed, his infallibility is thereby rendered quite useless; since, in every particular case, we may doubt, and that doubt cannot be removed, whether the information, upon which he acts, was right, or not.

But what most of all distinguished the pontificate of Victor was, the famous controversy about the celebration of Easter, between the eastern and western bishops; the former keeping that solemnity on the 14th day of the first moon, on what day soever of the week it happened to fall; and the latter putting it off till the Sunday following. This, surely, could not be a point of any consequence, since the apostles had not thought fit to settle any thing concerning it; nay, by observing the paschal solemnity themselves, some on the one day, and some on the other, as it is manifest they did,<sup>1</sup> they plainly declared, that it was quite indifferent on what day it was observed. Accordingly, from the apostles' time to Victor's, each church had followed the custom and practice established by their respective founders, without giving the least disturbance to others, or being, on that account, disturbed by them.<sup>2</sup> Pope Anicetus even suffered such of the Asiatics as happened to be at Rome, to celebrate Easter after the manner of Asia:<sup>3</sup> Soter, indeed, and his successor Eleutherius, obliged those who lived at Rome to conform to the custom of that church; but that did not prevent their sending the eucharist, or sacrament, to the bishops who followed the opposite practice;<sup>4</sup> for a custom then obtained among bishops to send the eucharist to each other, especially at Easter, in token of communion and peace; but this custom was suppressed by the 14th canon of the council held in the fourth century at Laodicea.<sup>5</sup> Victor, not satisfied with what his two immediate predecessors had done, took upon him to impose the Roman custom on all the churches that followed the contrary practice. But, in this bold attempt, which we may call the first essay of papal usurpation, he met with a vigorous and truly Christian opposition from Polycrates, at that time Bishop of Ephesus, and one of the most eminent men in the church, both for piety and learning. He had studied, says Eusebius,<sup>6</sup> the Scriptures with great attention, had conferred with Christians from all parts of the world, and had ever conformed his

life to the rules of the gospel. Jerom speaks of him as a man of excellent parts, and one universally respected.<sup>1</sup> In the present controversy, he peremptorily refused to relinquish the practice of his own church, which had been first introduced by the apostles St. John and St. Philip, and had been handed down to him by seven bishops of his own family.<sup>2</sup> Hereupon Victor, impatient of contradiction, wrote a letter, threatening to cut him off from his communion, unless he forthwith complied with the practice of the Church of Rome.<sup>3</sup> Polycrates, greatly surprised at the hasty proceedings of his fellow-bishop, assembled in Ephesus a council of all the bishops of Asia Minor, when it was unanimously resolved, that the practice, which they had received from their predecessors, ought not to be changed.<sup>4</sup> Agreeably to this resolution, Polycrates wrote to Victor, acquainting him therewith; and, at the same time, modestly insinuating, that, as to his menaces, he had better forbear them, since they had no manner of effect upon him, or his brethren.<sup>5</sup> Upon the receipt of this letter, Victor, giving the reins to an impotent and ungovernable passion, published bitter invectives against all the churches of Asia, declared them cut off from his communion, sent letters of excommunication to their respective bishops; and, at the same time, in order to have them cut off from the communion of the whole church, wrote to the other bishops, exhorting them to follow his example, and forbear communicating with their refractory brethren of Asia.<sup>6</sup> They all complied, to be sure, with the desire of the head of the church, who had power to command; but, out of his great moderation, chose to exhort and advise! No; not one followed his example, or advice; not one paid any sort of regard to his letters, or showed the least inclination to second him in such a rash and uncharitable attempt; but, on the contrary, they all joined, as Eusebius assures us,<sup>7</sup> in sharply censuring and rebuking him, as a disturber of the peace of the church. Among the rest Irenæus, then Bishop of Lyons, wrote him an excellent letter, putting him in mind of the moderation of his predecessors, and telling him, that though he agreed with him in the main of the controversy, yet he could not approve of his cutting off whole churches, for the observance of customs which they had received from their ancestors. He wrote, at the same time, to many other bishops,<sup>8</sup> no doubt, to dissuade them from joining the Bishop of Rome. However that be, it is certain, that, by this means, the storm was laid, a calm was restored to the church, and the Asiatics allowed to follow undisturbed their ancient

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, 25; Socrat. l. 5, c. 21; Epiph. hæ. 70, c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. c. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Concil. per Labb. t. 1, p. 150.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 22, et 24.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 45. <sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 45.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 24; Socrat. l. 5, c. 22.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. ib.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. ib. et Socrat. l. 5, c. 22.



Had no power over the Asiatics. Victor dies. His works. He is sainted. A dreadful persecution against the Christians. Zephyrinus opposes the Theodotian heretics. The heresy of Praxeas. Origen at Rome.

practice.<sup>1</sup> But Pope Victor, says Baronius,<sup>2</sup> excommunicated the Asiatics, which he would never have ventured to do, had he not known that he had power and jurisdiction over them. The argument may be thus retorted against him: the Asiatics made no account of his excommunication; which they would not have ventured to do, had they not known that he had no power nor jurisdiction over them. Besides, Victor did not excommunicate them, as that word is now understood; that is, he did not cut them off from the communion of the catholic church; for all the other bishops continued to communicate with them, as they had done before; he only separated himself from their communion, which was no more than every bishop had power to do. Victor being thus baffled in his attempt, his successors took care not to revive the controversy; so that the Asiatics peaceably followed their ancient practice till the council of Nice, which, out of complaisance to Constantine the Great, ordered the solemnity of Easter to be kept everywhere on the same day, after the custom of Rome.<sup>3</sup>

This dispute happened, not in the reign of Commodus, as we read in the Synodicon,<sup>1</sup> but in the fourth year of the reign of Severus, as St. Jerom informs us,<sup>2</sup> of Christ 196. Victor, of whom we find nothing else in the ancients worthy of notice, died five years after,<sup>3</sup> that is, in the ninth of the Emperor Severus, and in the end of 201, or the beginning of 202 of Christ, having governed the church ten years. He is named by St. Jerom, the first among the ecclesiastical authors that wrote in Latin.<sup>4</sup> He published a piece on the controversy about the celebration of Easter, and some other books on religious subjects, which were still extant in St. Jerom's time.<sup>5</sup> As for the two Decretals that are ascribed to him, and the two letters to Desiderius and Parocoda, both bishops of Vienna, they are universally rejected.<sup>6</sup> The Church of Rome has placed Victor among her saints; and truly, his attempt, however unsuccessful, to promote the power and extend the jurisdiction of that see, deserved no less a reward.

## ZEPHYRINUS, FOURTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[SEVERUS, CARACALLA, GETA, MACRINUS, DIADUMENUS, HELIOGABALUS.]

[Year of Christ 201.] IN the first year of the pontificate of Zephyrinus, who succeeded Victor, a dreadful persecution was raised against the Christians by the Emperor Severus, and carried on with great cruelty in all parts of the empire. Zephyrinus, however, had the good luck to escape it, and to see the church, by the death of that prince, happily delivered from the evils, which the rage of her foreign enemies had brought upon her. But her domestic enemies gave her no respite; the Theodotian heretics continued sowing, and not without success, their pestilential errors at Rome. Zephyrinus, it seems, opposed them with great vigor and zeal; for they reproached him, as we read in Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> as the first who had betrayed the truth, by maintaining against them the divinity of Christ: hence he is ranked by Optatus, with Tertullian, Victorinus, &c., among those who have successfully defended the Catholic Church.<sup>5</sup> Baronius, to extol Zephyrinus, ascribes to him the first condemnation of Praxeas,<sup>6</sup> which was followed by a solemn retractation under his own hand. But it was in Africa, and not at Rome, that Praxeas was condemned, as appeared plain to me, from

the words of Tertullian,<sup>7</sup> before I had seen either Pamelius or Moreau, who understood them in that sense. Praxeas, as we have observed above, had done an eminent piece of service to the Church of Rome, by reclaiming Pope Victor from the heresy of Montanus: but the good he had done on that occasion was overbalanced by the mischief his new heresy occasioned both at Rome and in Africa; for in both places he gained many proselytes. He denied all distinction of persons in the Godhead, so that the Father being, according to his doctrine, the same person with the Son, it was he who took upon him human nature, and suffered on the cross; whence his followers were called Patropassians.<sup>8</sup>

In the pontificate of Zephyrinus, and, as Eusebius seems to insinuate, in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla, that is, towards the year 211 or 212, came to Rome the celebrated Origen, being desirous, as he himself declared, to see that church, so venerable for its antiquity and renown; but, after a very short stay there, he returned to Alexandria.<sup>9</sup> About the same time happened, at Rome, the famous dispute between Caius, a presbyter

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 35; Phot. c. 120; Cypr. ep. 75; Anast. p. 445. <sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 198, n. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. vit. Const. l. 3, c. 18; Soz. l. 1, c. 16; Concil. l. 3, c. 18, 19, p. 492.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 28.

<sup>6</sup> Bar. ad ann. 196, n. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Opt. l. 1, c. 37.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Labb. t. 1. p. 601.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 43, et chron.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 28; Hier. chron.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. de vir. ill. c. 34, 40.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>6</sup> Pears. posth. p. 91, 92; Bosquet. l. 3, c. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Tert. in Prax. c. 1, p. 634.

<sup>8</sup> Catén. Græc. Patr. c. 53.

<sup>9</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 14.



Dispute at Rome between Caius and Proclus. Tertullian falls off from the church. The titles of High pontiff, &c. Zephyrinus not a Martyr. Alexander favourable to the Christians.

of that church, and Proclus, a leading man among the Montanists.<sup>1</sup> Caius committed to writing the reasons and arguments on both sides:<sup>2</sup> but that piece has not reached our times, though it was well known to Eusebius, who styles it a dialogue,<sup>3</sup> and likewise to Theodoret.<sup>4</sup>

It was during the pontificate of Zephyrinus, that Tertullian, the great defender of the Christian religion, fell off from the Catholic Church. His fall, which was lamented by all the faithful as a common loss, is ascribed, by St. Jerom, to the envy and ill usage he met with from the Roman clergy.<sup>5</sup> But how ill soever he was used by them in those days, he has perhaps met with worse treatment at their hands in latter times; for they call upon him as an evidence, to witness the pope's universal jurisdiction, and to confirm to him the haughty titles which he assumes; but with how little reason, will appear from the following relation: A Catholic bishop had, by a public declaration, admitted persons guilty of adultery and fornication to a place among the penitents. As Tertullian was a strict observer of rites and discipline, and a most zealous assertor of the greatest rigours of religion, he could not brook so much moderation and indulgence: and therefore, in his book *De Pudicitia*, which he wrote on that occasion, he extols the severity of the ancient discipline, aggravates the greatness of those offences, undertakes to confute the arguments for remission and indulgence; and, speaking of the above-mentioned declaration, he calls it "a peremptory decree," and styles the bishop who made it, "high pontiff, and bishop of bishops."<sup>6</sup> Hence the advocates for the see of Rome infer, that, even in those

early times, such titles were given to the Bishop of Rome, and that his decrees were even then deemed peremptory.<sup>1</sup> But, in the first place, it is uncertain whether that declaration was published by the Bishop of Rome, or by some other great bishop, perhaps of Carthage, of Alexandria, or Antioch; for no bishop is named by Tertullian. In the second place, it is evident from the context, that, in the above-mentioned passage, Tertullian speaks ironically; and consequently all that can be inferred from thence is, that he gave those titles to the Catholic bishop, whoever he was, by way of derision; or if the bishop had assumed them in his Declaration, he took from thence occasion to expose his vanity and ambition. Baronius, and the flatterers of the bishops of Rome, triumph in this passage of Tertullian; from which however nothing can be inferred in favor of that see, unless they prove, which they can never do, that the above-mentioned declaration or decree was published by the Bishop of Rome; that those titles, which raise him above other bishops, were part of the decree; and lastly, that Tertullian mentioned them as due to him, and not by way of sarcasm, ironically reflecting on his pride and ambition.

As to the actions of Zephyrinus, the ancients have left us quite in the dark; and we cannot depend on what we read in the modern writers. He governed about seventeen years, and died in the first year of Heliogabalus, and 218 of the Christian era.<sup>2</sup> In the Roman martyrology he has a place among the martyrs, which puts Baronius himself to a stand,<sup>3</sup> since the church enjoyed a profound tranquillity from the death of Severus to the end of his pontificate.

## CALLISTUS, FIFTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HELIOGABALUS, ALEXANDER SEVERUS.]

[Year of Christ, 219.] ZEPHYRINUS was succeeded by Callistus, or Callixtus, as he is styled by Optatus,<sup>7</sup> and St. Austin.<sup>8</sup> In his time the church enjoyed a long, happy, and uninterrupted peace, as Tertullian calls it,<sup>9</sup> which lasted from the death of Severus in 211, to the reign of Maximinus in 235, as did also the state from the death of Macrinus in 218, to the year 233. Alexander, who succeeded Heliogabalus in 222, proved extremely favorable to the Christians, and even allowed them, if I mistake not the

meaning of a profane writer, the free exercise of their religion:<sup>4</sup> it is at least certain, that he adjudged to them, against the tavern-keepers, a piece of ground, which it is pretended they had usurped upon the public, saying, when he gave sentence in their favour, that it was better God should be served on it in any manner, than that it should be occupied by tavern-keepers;<sup>5</sup> which was giving them leave to serve God on it after their own manner. On this spot of ground, Baronius supposes Callistus to have built a church in honor of the virgin Mary, known

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 34; Hier. vir. ill. c. 59.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. c. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Idem, l. 3, c. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Theod. hæret. fab. l. 3, c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. de Pudic. c. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>8</sup> Aug. ep. 53.

<sup>9</sup> Tert. de cor. mil.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 216, n. 5, 6, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 21 et chron.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 221, n. 1, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Lamprid. in vit.; Alex. p. 121.

<sup>5</sup> Idem. ib. p. 131.



Callistus's burying-place. The Acts of Callistus deserve no credit. Many saints ought to be expunged out of the catalogue. Callistus not a Martyr.

at present by the name of Santa Maria in Trastevere, that is, Saint Mary beyond the Tiber.<sup>1</sup> But the pontifical of Damasus, upon which alone he founds his opinion, deserves no credit, as I shall show in the life of that pope. Callistus is said by Anastasius<sup>2</sup> to have enclosed a large piece of ground on the Appian way, to serve as a burying-place for the Christians. This ground is frequently mentioned in the martyrologies, and described at length by Arringhus, who tells us, that one hundred and seventy-four thousand martyrs, and forty-six popes, were buried in it.<sup>3</sup> Though Alexander was of all the pagan emperors the most favorable and indulgent to the Christians, as is evident from all the ancient writers, both Christians and Pagans, yet he is represented in the martyrologies, and in the Acts of some martyrs, especially of Callistus, to which Bede gave an entire credit,<sup>4</sup> as the most barbarous and inhuman tyrant that ever shed Christian blood. If we reject these Acts, and we must either reject them, or the authority of the most unexceptionable writers among the ancients, we expunge at once above three hundred martyrs out of the catalogue of saints worshipped to this day by the Church of Rome, upon the bare authority of such Acts. Among these are the consul Palmatius, with his wife, his children, and forty-two of his domestics; the senator Simplicius, with his wife, and sixty-eight of his domestics: and, what will be an irreparable loss, the so much celebrated St. Cæcilia, in whose honor churches have been erected in every Christian kingdom. Baronius, not presuming on one side to question the Emperor Alexander's kindness to the Christians, which would be giving the lie to all the ancients, but, on the other, looking upon it as a sacrilege to rob the church of so many valuable relics, ascribes the cruel usage they are supposed to have met with in that prince's reign, not to him, but to Ulpian the celebrated civilian, who flourished under him.<sup>5</sup> But in those Acts, the martyrs are said to have suffered unheard-of torments, there minutely described, by the express command of the Emperor Alexander. Besides, could Alex-

ander be said to have favored the Christians, could the Christians be said to have enjoyed a happy tranquillity under him, had one of his officers persecuted them with the utmost cruelty in his name, and by his authority? Baronius, not remembering, it seems, that in this place he had charged Ulpian with all the cruelties against the Christians, supposes elsewhere<sup>1</sup> several martyrs to have suffered in the reign of Alexander, after the death of Ulpian. Bede, 'tis true, has followed these Acts; but they are not on that account at all the more credible, since he often follows pieces which are now universally given up as supposititious. The very first words of these Acts are sufficient to make us suspect the truth of them; for they begin thus: In the time of Macrinus and Alexander—How come these two princes to be joined together? Macrinus reigned with his son Diadumenus, and Heliogabalus between them and Alexander. Soon after, the consul Palmatius is said to have been condemned without any form of judgment, without so much as being heard; whereas Herodian assures us, that Alexander was a strict observer of the laws; and that no criminal was condemned in his reign, but according to the usual course of law, and by judges of the greatest integrity.<sup>2</sup> Callistus, if we give credit to his Acts, was kept a long time prisoner in a private house, where he was every day cruelly beaten by the Emperor Alexander's orders, and at last thrown headlong out of the window into a well. The Acts are evidently fabulous, but Callistus nevertheless is worshipped among the martyrs; and the waters of the well, which is to be seen at Rome in the church that bears his name, are said to cure all sorts of diseases to this day. He governed the church five years, and died in the latter end of the year 223,<sup>3</sup> the third of the Emperor Alexander. His body is exposed to public adoration on the 10th of May, in the Church of St. Mary, beyond the Tiber, at Rome,<sup>4</sup> and in that of Our Lady at Rheims.<sup>5</sup> Two decretals are ascribed to Callistus, and likewise the institution of the ember weeks, but without the least foundation.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 224, n. 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Anast. in vit. Call.

<sup>3</sup> Arring. l. 3, c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Bed. Martyr. 10 Maii, 14 Oct

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 226, n. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Idem. ad ann. 232, n. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. l. vi. p. 575, 588.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 21, et in chron.

<sup>4</sup> Bolland. 10 Maii, 493, 499.

<sup>5</sup> Arring. l. 2, c. 12; Theod. l. 4, c. 1, 2, 6, 8.



## URBANUS, SIXTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXANDER.]

[Year of Christ 223.] ALL I can find in the ancients concerning Urban, the successor of Callistus, is, that during the whole time of his pontificate, both church and state enjoyed a profound peace under the Emperor Alexander; that he held the chair near seven years, and died about the middle of the year 230.<sup>1</sup> Great and wonderful things are related of him in his Acts, and in those of St. Cæcilia; but such Acts<sup>2</sup> are evidently fabu-

lous, since, in opposition to all the ancients, they represent the Emperor Alexander as a most cruel persecutor of the Christian name. Urban himself is supposed to have suffered under him, and placed accordingly by the Church of Rome among her martyrs. His body is now worshipped in an abbey of his name in the diocese of Chalons on the Marne, and in the Church of St. Cæcilia at Rome.<sup>1</sup>

## PONTIANUS, SEVENTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXANDER, MAXIMINUS.]

[Year of Christ 230.] PONTIANUS succeeded Urban in 230, and governed, according to the pontifical of Bucherius,<sup>3</sup> five years, two months, and seven days; that is, from

the 22d of July, 230, to the 28th of September, 235.<sup>2</sup> In the second year of his pontificate, the famous Origen was deposed and excommunicated by Demetrius bishop of

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Bed. Martyr. & Boll. 25 Maii.

<sup>3</sup> This pontifical, well known to Cuspinian, F. Petau, and other chronologers, was published by Bucherius the Jesuit, in 1633, with the paschal cycle of Victorius. It is a catalogue of the bishops of Rome, from the foundation of that see to the time of Liberius, who was chosen in 352. As the election of Liberius is marked, and not his death, the catalogue is supposed by some to have been written in his time. His election is marked thus: *Liberius fuit temporibus Constantii ex die xi. Kalendas Junias in diem—a Consulibus Constantio V. et Constantio Cæsare*—By Constantius Cæsar is meant Gallus, the son of Julius Constantius, who, by his father Constantius Chlorus, was half-brother to Constantine the Great. Gallus was raised by the Emperor Constantius to the dignity of Cæsar in the year 351, on which occasion he gave him his own name, (Aurel. Vict. p. 518; Socr. l. 2, c. 28.) and the following year took him for his colleague in his fifth consulship, as appears from Idatius, from Prosper, and from the Alexandrian Chronicle. The above-mentioned pontifical is very faulty in the times preceding the pontificate of Pontianus, who was chosen in 230, nay, if we believe Bucherius, Anicetus, Eleutherius, and Zephyrinus, are omitted in it. I said, *if we believe* Bucherius; for Bollandus, another Jesuit, who perused the same manuscript, assures us, that he found there the names of those three bishops, which Bucherius assures us were not to be found there, (Bolland. Apr. t. 1, p. 22—24.) Which of the two Jesuits is the most honest is hard to determine in any case, but impossible in this, unless the original manuscript should be produced, which both perused. F. Pagi, the Franciscan, seems to favour Bucherius; for he complains of Bollandus for interpolating the manuscript, and not publishing it with all its faults and chasms, as Bucherius had done. But then he does not tell us that he had seen the original manuscript. Bollandus, on the other hand, complains of Bucherius for undervaluing such an invaluable piece; and settles by it his whole chronology of the popes, pretending it to have been sent by Pope Damasus to St. Jerom. (Bolland. ib. p. 3, n. 10.) But for this the only ground he has are some letters from Damasus to St. Jerom, and from Jerom to Damasus, which, by the best judges, are all thought supposititious. But even allowing it to have been sent by Damasus to St. Jerom, that ought not to recommend it more to our esteem than it did to his; and he seems to have paid very little regard to it: for in his Book of Illustrious men, which he wrote after the death of Damasus, he places Clement

after Anacletus, though that pontifical puts Anacletus after Clement. (Hier. de vir. illustr. c. 15.)

What I have hitherto said is to be understood with respect to the times preceding the pontificate of Pontianus; for, from his time, the pontifical of Bucherius is almost quite exact to the end, that is, to the election of Liberius; and the more exact, the nearer it comes to his time. I said *almost*, for it is not even thenceforth free from all faults; but it has fewer than any other ancient record that has reached us; and it is on this consideration that, from the time of Pontianus, I have preferred it to all others. With respect to his predecessors, I have adopted the chronology of Eusebins, where it does not appear that he was mistaken; for that he was mistaken in some points is but too plain; and, for aught we know, he may have been so in many others. But as in those dark times we have no authentic records, no indisputable authorities, to depend on, I thought it more advisable to tread in the footsteps of so famous and ancient a writer, than, by attempting to open a new way, perplex and confound both myself and the reader, as Pearson, Dodwell, and Pagi, have done. And it was not, I must own, without some concern, that I found a man of Dr. Pearson's learning reduced, by undervaluing the authority of Eusebius, to take for his guide a writer of no authority at all, namely, Eutychius of Alexandria, who flourished so late as the tenth century, and is only famous for his blunders, even in what relates to his own church.

To the pontifical were annexed, in the same ancient manuscript, several other small pieces; viz., 1. A list of the consuls from the year 205 to 354, with the epacts, bissextile years, and the day of the week with which each year began. There are some mistakes in the epacts, but the rest is done with great exactness. 2. Another list of the consuls and governors of Rome, from the year 254 to 354. 3. A short necrology of the bishops of Rome, in which are marked, according to the order of the months, the day on which each of them died, and the place where he was buried. It begins with Lucius, and ends with Julius. In this list, Sixtus II. and Marcellus are omitted; the latter probably by a mistake of the transcriber, confounding him with his predecessor, Marcellinus; and the former, perhaps, because he is set down in the calendar of martyrs annexed to the necrology. These pieces, as well as the pontifical, all end at the year 354, whence Cardinal Noris (Fast. consular. p. 23) and others are of opinion, that they were written that year.

<sup>1</sup> Eric. l. 1, c. 12; Bolland. 25 Maii.

<sup>2</sup> Bolland. April. t. 1, p. 25.



The Persecution of Maximinus. Pontianus banished to Sardinia. Anterus probably dies a Martyr. Miraculous election of Fabianus. Not all popes thus chosen. Fabianus worthy of the dignity to which he was raised.

Alexandria, and the sentence approved of by most other bishops, especially by the Bishop of Rome, who assembled, it seems, his clergy on that occasion: for what else could St. Jerom mean, by telling us, that Rome assembled her senate against Origen?<sup>1</sup> The calm and quiet days which the church had for some years enjoyed, especially under Alexander, expired almost with the pontificate of Pontianus; for that excellent prince

being assassinated in the month of May, 235, Maximinus, who succeeded him, out of hatred to him, began to persecute with great cruelty the Christians, whom he had so much favored, especially the bishops.<sup>1</sup> Pontianus, among the rest, was banished Rome, and confined to the unwholesome island of Sardinia,<sup>2</sup> where he died the same year, on the 28th of September, but of what kind of death is not well known.<sup>3</sup>

## ANTERUS, EIGHTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMINUS.]

[Year of Christ 235.] ANTERUS, the successor of Pontianus, presided only one month and ten days, and died on the 3d of January, 236.<sup>2</sup> Some modern writers place one Cyriacus between him and Pontianus; but their opinion, founded on the authority of the fabulous Acts of St. Ursula, is sufficiently confuted by Eusebius,<sup>3</sup> Optatus,<sup>4</sup> St. Augustin,<sup>5</sup>

and Nicephorus,<sup>4</sup> who all name Anterus as the immediate successor of Pontianus. The shortness of his pontificate, and the cruel persecution carried on by Maximinus, give us room to believe that he died a martyr, which title is given him in the martyrologies of St. Jerom and Bede.<sup>5</sup>

## FABIANUS, NINETEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMINUS, GORDIAN, PHILIP, DECIUS.]

[Year of Christ 236.] FABIANUS, called by the Greeks Fabius, by Eutychius,<sup>6</sup> and in the Chronicle of Alexandria, Flavianus,<sup>7</sup> was, according to Eusebius, miraculously chosen for successor to Anterus; for he tells us, "That the people and clergy being assembled in order to proceed to a new election, a dove, unexpectedly appearing, settled, to the great surprise of all present, on the head of Fabianus, who was not so much as thought of, being but a layman, as appears from the account, and not an inhabitant of Rome, but just then come out of the country. At this prodigy the whole assembly cried out with one voice, 'Fabianus is our bishop;' and, crowding round him, placed him without further delay on the episcopal throne."—Thus Eusebius:<sup>8</sup> and to his account is owing the modern notion, that the pope is always chosen by the Holy Ghost. "What happened in the election of St. Fabianus," says Cardinal Cusani, "happens in the election of every pope. 'Tis true we do not see the Holy Ghost with our corporeal eyes; but we may and must see him, if we are not quite blind, with those of the mind. In vain, therefore, O eminent

electors, are all your intrigues; the person, on whose head the heavenly dove is pleased to perch, will, in spite of them, be chosen."<sup>6</sup> In the sequel of this history, we shall see such monsters of iniquity elected, and by such scandalous practices, that to imagine the Holy Ghost anyways concerned in the election would be absolute blasphemy.

As for Fabianus, he seems to have been well worthy of the post to which he was raised; for the famous Bishop of Carthage, St. Cyprian, in answer to the letter, wherein the clergy of Rome gave him an account of the glorious death of their bishop, calls him "an excellent man;" and adds, that "the glory of his death had answered the purity, holiness, and integrity of his life."<sup>7</sup> From the pontifical of Bucherius we learn, that he appointed seven deacons over the fourteen regions or wards, into which Rome was then divided,<sup>8</sup> to take care of the poor, says Baronius.<sup>9</sup> We read in other more modern pontificals, that he named seven subdeacons to overlook the seven notaries, who are supposed

<sup>1</sup> Ruf. in Hier. l. 2, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ep. 165.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. Al. p. 630.

<sup>5</sup> Boll. pont. p. 23—32.

<sup>6</sup> Opt. contr. Par. l. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Eutych. p. 384.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 29.

<sup>1</sup> Oros. l. 7, c. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Hallo. vit. Orig. p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Boll. Apr. t. 1, p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Niceph. chron.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Flor. p. 995—997.

<sup>6</sup> Card. Cus. de meth. consistorii, c. 7, p. 85.

<sup>7</sup> Cypr. ep. 4, et 31.

<sup>8</sup> Buch. cycl. 271.

<sup>9</sup> Bar. ad ann. 112, n. 9.



Fabianus said to have converted the Emperor Philip. Fabianus martyred in the persecution of Decius. The See vacant. The opinion of the Roman clergy concerning the lapsed. They disown the Pope's infallibility.

to have been first appointed by Pope Clement, and whose province it was to commit to writing the actions and speeches of the martyrs. It is manifest from St. Cyprian,<sup>1</sup> as Dr. Pearson well observes, that in the time of Cornelius, the successor of Fabianus, the Church of Rome had seven subdeacons, to whom St. Cyprian recommended the strictest exactness in marking the day of each martyr's death.<sup>2</sup> As for taking down their speeches, which some seem to object to, the art of writing in shorthand was well known in those times. Eusebius tells us, that by Tiro, Cicero's freedman, were first invented certain marks, which stood not only for whole words, but entire sentences.<sup>3</sup> But this invention is, by Dio, ascribed to Mæcenas, who ordered his freedman Aquila to make them known to all who cared to learn them.<sup>4</sup> Of their wonderful quickness in writing, with the help of these marks, Martial takes notice, in one of his distichs, saying, "how fast so ever the tongue may run, the hand runs faster."<sup>5</sup>

Baronius<sup>6</sup> and Bollandus<sup>7</sup> ascribe to Fabianus the conversion of the Emperor Philip, and his son; adding, from the acts of Pontius the martyr, that he pulled down the great temple of the Romans, that he dashed to pieces their idols, and converted the whole city. What a pity that such wonderful feats should have been passed over in silence by Eusebius, and all the ancients! As for the conversion of Philip and his son, it is questioned by many, and very justly, the silence of Eusebius alone being an unanswerable evidence against it; but all agree, that if he was instructed and converted by Fabianus, he did no great honor either to his instructor or his religion. In the latter end of the year 249, the Emperor Philip being killed by the rebellious soldiery at Verona, Decius, who was raised to the empire in his room, began his reign with the most dreadful persecution that had ever yet afflicted the church. Fabianus was one of the first that fell a victim to the implacable hatred this emperor bore to the Christian name. He was put to death on the 20th of January, 250, while Decius was consul the second time, together with Gratus, after having governed the church fourteen years, one month, and ten days.<sup>8</sup>

[Year of Christ 250.] The death of Fabianus was followed by a vacancy, which lasted at least sixteen months, the Christians being either imprisoned, or so dispersed, that they could not assemble to choose a new bishop. During this interval, the clergy, that is, the presbyters and deacons, took upon themselves the care and administration of all ecclesiastical matters; and, being informed by Clementius, subdeacon of the church of Carthage, who came to Rome about Easter, in 250, that St. Cyprian had been obliged, by the fury of the persecution, to withdraw for a while from his see, they wrote to that clergy, exhorting them to follow their example.<sup>1</sup> Several excellent letters passed on this occasion between the clergy of Rome, and St. Cyprian and his clergy, especially concerning the method they were to hold with the lapsed; that is, with those who had either obtained of the pagan magistrates protections, or libels of safety, whence they were called *Libellatici*, or had actually sacrificed to idols, and were thence named *Sacrificati*. In one of these letters, the Roman clergy, after having maturely examined so material a point, and advised not only with the neighboring bishops, but with others, who, from the distant provinces, had fled for concealment to Rome, declare it was their opinion, "That such of the lapsed as were at the point of death, should, upon an unfeigned repentance, be admitted to the communion of the church, but that the cause of others should be put off till the election of a new bishop, when, together with him, with other bishops, with the priests, deacons, confessors, and laymen, who had stood firm, they should take their case into consideration;" adding, "that a crime committed by many ought not to be judged by one; and that a decree could not be binding without the consent and approbation of many."<sup>2</sup> Could they in more plain and express terms disown the infallibility of the pope their bishop? Could they upon mature deliberation write thus, and at the same time believe his judgment an infallible rule? Such a proposition would, in these days, be deemed heretical; and no wonder; the pope's infallibility must be maintained at all events; and to maintain it is impossible, without condemning, as heretical, the doctrine taught by the church in the first and purest ages.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. in chron.

<sup>3</sup> Mart. l. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Boll. 20 Jan. p. 253.

<sup>5</sup> Pears. posth. p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Dio Olymp. 193, ann. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Bar. ad ann. 246, n. 9.

<sup>8</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 267.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 31.



The character of Cornelius by St. Cyprian. Novatian refuses to acknowledge him. St. Cyprian calls a council, which acknowledges Cornelius. Resolutions of the council of Africa concerning the lapsed.

## CORNELIUS, TWENTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[DECIVS, GALLVS.]

[Year of Christ 251.] AFTER the see had been vacant for the space of sixteen months, Cornelius, a presbyter of the church of Rome, was at last elected,<sup>1</sup> on the 4th of June, 251, according to the most probable opinion.<sup>2</sup> He was, according to St. Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> a man of an unblemished character, and, on account of his peaceable temper, his great modesty, his integrity, and many other eminent virtues, well worthy of the dignity to which he was raised. He did not attain at once, says the same writer, to the height of the priesthood, but after he had passed through all the inferior degrees, agreeably to the discipline of the church. He was so far from using intrigues, from intruding himself by violence, as some have done, that violence was necessary to make him accept the dignity offered him. He was ordained bishop, continues St. Cyprian, by some of our colleagues, who, being then at Rome, conformed to the judgment of the whole people and clergy.<sup>4</sup> As Decius was still alive, who had declared, that he had rather bear with a competitor to his crown, than with a Bishop of Rome,<sup>5</sup> the Christians, in all likelihood, laid hold of the opportunity, which the revolt of Valens gave them, to choose a new bishop; for this very year Julius Valens revolting, caused himself to be proclaimed emperor in Rome;<sup>6</sup> and though he held the empire but a very short time, yet his revolt might divert Decius for a while from persecuting the Christians.

Though Cornelius was chosen by the unanimous voice of the people and clergy, yet Novatian, a presbyter of the church of Rome, who aspired to the same dignity, not only refused to acknowledge him; but having gained a considerable party among the people, five presbyters, and some confessors, he wrote in their name and his own to St. Cyprian, and no doubt to many other bishops, laying heinous crimes to the charge of Cornelius; namely, his having sued for a protection from the pagan magistrates, which was ranking him among the Libellatici, who were excluded from all dignities and employments in the church. St. Cyprian having received this letter, and at the same time one from Cornelius, acquainting him with his election, as was customary in those times among bishops, he caused the one to be read in a full assembly of the people and clergy,

but suppressed the other, looking upon it as a scandalous libel.<sup>1</sup> However, to prevent the calumnies and false reports that might be spread abroad by Novatian and his partisans, he assembled a council of all the bishops of his province, who, hearing of the schism in the church of Rome, resolved to send thither two of their body, who should carefully inform themselves of what had passed in the late election, and on their return make a faithful report of all they had learnt. Pursuant to this resolution, Caldonius and Fortunatus, two African bishops, were despatched to Rome with letters from the council to the clergy of that city, and to the bishops who had been present at the ordination of Cornelius. The bishops no sooner received these letters than they answered them, assuring their brethren in Africa, that Cornelius had been lawfully chosen; and at the same time commending him as a person, on account of his extraordinary piety and exemplary life, most worthy of the dignity to which he had been raised. Their testimony was soon after confirmed by Caldonius and Fortunatus returning from Rome, and likewise by Stephanus and Pompeius, two African bishops, who had assisted at the ordination of Cornelius; so that he was universally acknowledged all over Africa.<sup>2</sup>

The African bishops no sooner acknowledged Cornelius than they acquainted him with the resolutions, which they had taken in their late council, with respect to the lapsed. The substance of these was, that such as had yielded to the fury of the persecution ought not to be abandoned, lest, giving themselves up to despair, they should fall into a total apostasy; but should be re-admitted to the union of the church upon a sincere repentance, and after a long penance: that the time of their penance should be shortened, or prolonged, according to the nature of their crimes; that is, the Libellatici should have a shorter time assigned them; and the Sacrificati, called also Thurificati, who had actually offered sacrifice, or frankincense, to idols, should not be admitted till they had expiated their offence by a very long penance; but that both the Libellatici and Sacrificati should be taken in, before the time of their penance was expired, if at the point of death, or even thought to be in danger.<sup>3</sup> As to fallen bishops, they were to be dealt with in the same manner; and, after due penance, or, as it is sometimes called, satisfaction, be admitted only in a lay capa-

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. chron. & l. 6, c. 33; Opt. l. 2; Aug. ep. 165, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Pears. Cyp. an. p. 29, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Aur. Vict.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. ep. 52.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ep. 52.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 41, 42, 45.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ep. 52, 54.



Novatian excommunicated. Wickedness of Novatus. He gains many to the party of Novatian. Novatian the first Anti-pope. He acquaints the other churches with his ordination.

city.<sup>1</sup> Cornelius did not, upon the receipt of these determinations or decrees, step into his oracular chair, and thence, as an infallible judge, condemn or approve them. Such arbitrary proceedings would not have been well relished by the bishops of Africa, nor even by his own clergy, who not long before had declared, that "a decree could not be binding without the consent and approbation of many." He therefore acted on this occasion as St. Cyprian had done, as other bishops did afterwards; that is, he assembled a council, which Eusebius calls "a great council;"<sup>2</sup> for it consisted of sixty bishops, and a great number of priests, deacons, and laymen, who, in those times, were admitted to all councils.<sup>3</sup> By this venerable assembly were the decrees of the council of Africa examined and approved, and then sent to be in like manner examined and approved by other bishops, till the whole church had agreed to them.<sup>4</sup>

At the council of Rome assisted, among other presbyters, Novatian: but as he maintained, in opposition to the whole assembly, that the lapsed were to be admitted upon no terms or satisfaction whatsoever, but should be left to the divine tribunal, he was himself cut off from that communion, which with an invincible obstinacy he denied to others.<sup>5</sup> Provoked at this sentence, he readily gave ear to the insinuations of Novatus, a presbyter of the church of Carthage, who had fled from thence to Rome, to avoid the sentence of excommunication, with which he was threatened by St. Cyprian, and the other bishops of Africa, for his scandalous doctrine, and irregular practices.<sup>6</sup> Pacianus paints him in the blackest colours: he stripped the orphans, says he, plundered the widows of the church of Carthage, and appropriated to himself the money belonging to the poor and the church:<sup>7</sup> he turned his father out of doors, and let him die of hunger in the streets, and would not even be at the trouble of burying him after his death. With a kick in the belly he made his wife miscarry, and bring forth a dead child: whence Pacianus calls him a traitor, an assassin, the murderer of his father and child.<sup>8</sup> As for his doctrine, he held, while at Carthage, tenets diametrically opposite to those he taught at Rome: for, at Carthage, he was for admitting to the communion of the church not only the lapsed, but all other sinners, let their crimes be ever so heinous, without any sort of penance; and, at Rome, for excluding them, let their penance be ever so long, let their repentance be ever so sincere.<sup>9</sup> At Carthage he found Felicissimus, of whom I shall speak hereafter, inclined to lenity; and Novatian, at Rome, to severity: and therefore, as he was a man

of great vanity, and no principles, he suited himself to the different tempers of such as he judged the most capable of raising him. At Rome, by a pretence to an uncommon sanctity and severity, he gained a great many followers, and among them some confessors lately delivered out of prison, from whom he extorted letters directed to Novatian, wherein they consented to the ordination of the said Novatian. In virtue of these letters he was accordingly ordained, some say in Rome,<sup>1</sup> others in a neighbouring village,<sup>2</sup> by three bishops sent for by Novatus out of the country for that purpose, and quite unacquainted with his views. Being thus ordained bishop, he was set up by the party against Cornelius, whom they charged with relaxing the discipline of the church, and communicating with the lapsed, especially with one Trophimus. This St. Cyprian calls a false and groundless charge; for, as to Trophimus, though he was in the number of the *Thurificati*, that is, though he had offered frankincense to idols, and even persuaded his flock (for he was a presbyter, if not a bishop) to follow his example, yet he had sufficiently atoned for his crime, by a sincere repentance, by a long penance, and above all, by bringing back his people with him, who would not have returned without him.<sup>3</sup> As for the others, 'tis true, he communicated with some who had not fulfilled the time of penance assigned them, but such only as, being admitted at the point of death, had afterwards recovered; which cannot otherwise be avoided, says St. Cyprian,<sup>4</sup> but by killing those to whom we granted the peace of the church, when we apprehended them to be in danger. Novatian having thus, by a pretended zeal for the discipline of the church, and the artful insinuations of Novatus, seduced a great many at Rome, who styled themselves the *Cathari*, that is, the pure, undefiled party; he wrote in their and his own name to the other churches, acquainting them with his ordination, exhorting them not to communicate with the lapsed upon any terms, and bitterly complaining of the scandalous lenity and remissness of Cornelius.<sup>5</sup> At the same time Cornelius wrote to the other bishops, giving them a faithful account of all that had happened at Rome, especially of the uncanonical ordination of Novatian. However, the letters of Novatian, signed by several confessors, who were greatly respected in those days, made no small impression on Antonianus an African bishop, and Fabius bishop of Antioch,<sup>6</sup> but quite gained over to the party Marcianus bishop of Arles.<sup>7</sup> The other bishops declared all to a man for Cornelius, especially St. Cyprian, and those of his province, who,

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Pacian. ep. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Theodoret. hæ. fab. l. 3, c. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Pacian. ep. 3; Hier. vir. ill. c. 70; Cypr. ep. 49.

<sup>7</sup> Pacian. ep. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Idem ib. & ep. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Cypr. ep. 40, 49.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. l. 3, c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 54.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 45; Socrat. l. 4, c. 28; Hier. vir. ill. c. 69.

<sup>6</sup> Cypr. ep. 52; Euseb. l. 6, c. 44.

<sup>7</sup> Cypr. ep. 67.



Novatian's deputies rejected and excommunicated in Africa. He sends new deputies into Africa. The name of Pope anciently common to all bishops. The deputies are everywhere rejected in Africa.

being assembled in a council when the deputies of Novatian arrived, excommunicated without further examination both him and them;<sup>1</sup> and well they might, since they had taken so much pains to inform themselves of the lawfulness of Cornelius's election, as we have related above. The deputies, though thus rejected with scorn and disgrace by the council, did not abandon the enterprise, but proselyting from town to town, nay, from house to house, inveigled a great many, under color of communicating with the confessors.<sup>2</sup> St. Cyprian therefore, whose zeal was not confined within the bounds, however extensive, of Africa, Numidia, and the two Mauritanias, to withdraw this main support from the party, wrote a short but nervous letter to the confessors, deploring the fault they had committed, by consenting to the unlawful ordination of Novatian, and exhorting them to return with all speed to the catholic church.<sup>3</sup> Dionysius bishop of Alexandria wrote them a pathetic letter to the same purpose;<sup>4</sup> and these letters had at last the desired effect; but not before Novatus, who had drawn them into the schism, left Rome; which happened on the following occasion:

Novatian, being informed that the deputies he had sent into Africa were everywhere rejected and despised, resolved to send others, whom he judged, on account of their rank and authority, more capable of promoting his design.<sup>5</sup> The persons he pitched upon were Nicostratus, Novatus, Evaristus, Primus, and Dionysius. Of the two last I find no farther mention made in history; of Novatus I have spoken above; and as for Evaristus and Nicostratus, the former was a bishop, and is supposed to have been one of the three that ordained Novatian. Nicostratus was a deacon of the church of Rome,<sup>6</sup> and had been imprisoned with the two presbyters Moses and Maximus, for the confession of the faith,<sup>7</sup> which entitled him to a place among the confessors. To these three St. Cyprian ascribes the excellent letter, as he styles it, which the confessors of Rome wrote to those of Carthage.<sup>8</sup> He was likewise one of the confessors, who wrote to St. Cyprian himself, as appears from the title of that admirable letter, which runs thus: "The presbyters Moses and Maximus, the deacons Nicostratus and Ruffinus, and the other confessors, who are with them, to Pope Cyprian."<sup>9</sup> We may here observe, by the way, that the name of Pope, which signifies no more than *father*, was anciently common to all bishops; but was afterwards, by a special decree of Gregory VII. appropriated to the Bishop of Rome. To return to Nicostratus, the character given him by St. Cyprian and Cornelius bespeaks him quite unworthy of being joined with the others, who are

named in that letter, and were all men of great piety: for he had squandered away the money belonging to the church, that was lodged in his hands, embezzled that of the widows and orphans, and defrauded a lady, who had trusted him with the management of her affairs.<sup>1</sup>

These new deputies met with no better a reception than the former had done: for St. Cyprian, being informed of their departure from Rome, by the confessor Augendus,<sup>2</sup> and soon after of their characters by the acolyte Nicephorus, both sent, for that purpose, by Cornelius,<sup>3</sup> he acquainted therewith the other catholic bishops, who, upon that intelligence, rejected them with the greatest indignation, as apostates and firebrands of sedition. Hereupon the deputies having, by the means and contrivance of Novatus, procured some of their party to be ordained bishops, and Nicostratus among the rest, they named them to the sees of the catholic bishops; which bred great confusion and disorder in the church, it being a difficult matter for the bishops in the distant provinces to distinguish between their lawful brethren and the intruders, and consequently to know whom they should admit to, and whom they should exclude from their communion. But against this evil a remedy was found by St. Cyprian, and the other African bishops, who, to arm him against the craft and arts of those subtle impostors, transmitted to him a list of all the catholic bishops of that province.<sup>4</sup>

The storm, which Novatus had raised in Rome, was laid by his departure; for he was no sooner gone, than the confessors whom he had seduced, viz., Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macarius, signified to Cornelius their eager desire of quitting his party, and returning to the communion of the church. Cornelius questioned, at first, their sincerity; but, being convinced of it at last, he assembled his clergy, not caring to trust to his own judgment, in order to advise with them, in what manner he should proceed in the present case. At this council assisted, besides the Roman clergy, five bishops, who either happened to be then at Rome, or, on this occasion, had been invited thither by Cornelius. They were scarce met, when the confessors, attended by a great crowd, appeared before them, testifying, with a flood of tears, the sincerity of their repentance, and begging they would forget their past criminal conduct. The council did not think it advisable to come to any resolution, till they had acquainted the people with the request of the confessors; which they no sooner did, than the people flocked to the place, and not upbraiding, but embracing, with tears of joy, their retrieved brethren, and with the same tenderness as if they had been just then delivered out of prison, pointed out to the council the

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Buch. p. 271.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ep. 26.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ep. 47, 79.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 46.

<sup>8</sup> Idem ep. 49.

<sup>9</sup> Cypr. ep. 23.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 48, 49.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ep. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ep. 55.



The confessors return to the church. In what manner Novatian endeavoured to keep the rest steady. A schism in the church of Carthage. The persecution renewed by Gallus. Cornelius apprehended.

method they were to pursue. Accordingly Cornelius, having, with the approbation of the council, made them renounce the errors of Novatian, and acknowledge him for the only lawful Bishop of Rome, readmitted them, without further satisfaction, to the communion of the church.<sup>1</sup> From this account I should imagine, that those who accompanied the confessors at their first appearing before the council, were Novatians, whom they had brought back with them; but I dare not affirm it, since St. Cyprian, in his answer to Cornelius, speaks only of the four above-mentioned confessors. The confessors being thus returned, to the inexpressible joy of the whole people, Cornelius, impatient to impart the good news to St. Cyprian, wrote to him, as soon as the council broke up, to acquaint him with what had happened, and invite him to partake of the common joy, to which he had so much contributed.<sup>2</sup> With this letter, Nicophorus the acolyte embarked, without delay, for Africa; and thence returned soon after with an answer, wherein St. Cyprian assured Cornelius, that the return of the confessors had caused an universal joy in Africa, both for their sake, and because it might open the eyes of many, and prove in the end the ruin of the schismatic party.<sup>3</sup> The confessors themselves wrote to St. Cyprian, upon their return,<sup>4</sup> who immediately answered them;<sup>5</sup> and, in all likelihood, to the other chief bishops of the church; since Eusebius informs us, that Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote twice to them after their return.<sup>6</sup> In the mean time Novatian, seeing great numbers moved by the example of the confessors, daily fall off from his party, to keep the rest steady by the most sacred ties, used, in administering the eucharist, to hold the hands of those who received it, with the holy bread in them, between his, and oblige them to swear, "by the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," that they would never abandon him, nor return to Cornelius.<sup>7</sup>

As the church of Rome was rent by the schism of Novatian, so was the church of Carthage by that of Felicissimus; and as the former, upon his being excommunicated by Cornelius and the council of Rome, had recourse to St. Cyprian, in like manner the latter, being cut off from the communion of the church by St. Cyprian and the council of Carthage, had recourse to Cornelius. But as the doctrine of Felicissimus, though diametrically opposite to that of Novatian, was equally repugnant to the catholic truth, and to the discipline established in the church, as I have observed above, he was at first rejected by Cornelius, with great steadiness and resolution. But the Bishop of Rome had, at last, been frightened into a compliance, had he not been animated and encouraged by St. Cy-

prian; for the followers of Felicissimus having, in imitation of the Novatians, appointed one of their own faction, named Fortunatus, Bishop of Carthage, Felicissimus took upon himself to carry to Cornelius the letters of the new and third bishop of that city. Accordingly he set out for Rome, attended by a troop of seditious, desperate, and abandoned men, says St. Cyprian.<sup>1</sup> Cornelius rejected them at first with great firmness, and immediately acquainted St. Cyprian with what had passed; but Felicissimus threatening to read publicly the letters he had brought, if Cornelius did not receive them, and to discover many scandalous things, he was not a little intimidated. He therefore wrote a second letter to St. Cyprian, but betrayed in it a great deal of fear and weakness: however, the excellent letter which St. Cyprian wrote in answer to his, inspired him with new vigour, and kept him steady.<sup>2</sup>

In the mean time, Decius being killed, the persecution was carried on, or rather renewed with more fury than ever, by Gallus, his successor. As the Roman empire was, at this time, afflicted with a dreadful plague, Gallus, who, it seems, had not molested the Christians during the first months of his reign,<sup>3</sup> issued an order, enjoining men of all ranks and professions to offer sacrifice to the gods, hoping, by that means, to appease their wrath, and put a stop to the raging evil. It was on occasion of this plague that St. Cyprian wrote his excellent discourse on Mortality, wherein he so eloquently teaches a Christian to triumph over the fears of death, and shows with how little reason we mourn for those friends and relations who are snatched from us. Such of the Christians as refused to comply with the emperor's edict were either banished or executed. Cornelius, among the rest, was apprehended at the first breaking out of the persecution, and made a glorious confession of his faith, as appears from St. Cyprian, who, on that occasion, wrote him a letter of congratulation.<sup>4</sup> What happened to him afterwards is uncertain; for his Acts are evidently fabulous, though they have been received by Bede, by Ado, by Anastasius, and many others, far more considerable for their number than their authority. We read in the pontifical of Bucherius, that he was banished to Centumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, and died of a natural death, according to the expression used there,<sup>5</sup> ("dormitionem accepit.") As to the title of martyr, with which he is distinguished by St. Jerom,<sup>6</sup> it was anciently given to all those who, for the confession of faith, died in prison, which in all likelihood happened to Cornelius.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 46. Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. ep. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ep. 50.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ep. 47.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ep. 51.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Buch. p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ep. 57.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. vit. Paul, p. 237.

<sup>7</sup> Cornelius is reckoned by St. Jerom among the ecclesiastical writers, on account of the four letters which he wrote to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, who seemed not to dislike the tenets of Novatian. (Hier. vir. ill. c. 66, p. 290.) He wrote several other letters, whereof two



Relics of Cornelius. Lucius is banished. Returns to Rome, and dies a Martyr.

Cornelius died on the same day of the month and the week on which St. Cyprian was martyred six years after;<sup>1</sup> that is, on the 14th of September, 252, according to the most probable opinion, having held the pontificate one year, three months, and ten days. His body is supposed to have been translated from Civita Vecchia to the cemetery of Callistus; for near that place Pope Leo I. is said to have built, in honour of Cornelius, a basilic or magnificent church.<sup>2</sup> His body was believed to be still at Rome in the end of the eighth century; for Anastasius tells us, that Pope Adrian placed it in a church, which he had built in Capracoro;<sup>3</sup> but it was soon after

removed from thence and brought into France, by Charlemagne, as Pamelius assures us, upon the authority of a small life of St. Cyprian, written, as he supposes, by Paulus Diaconus.<sup>4</sup>

Eusebius observes, that, in the time of Cornelius, the church of Rome was in a most flourishing condition; for, not to mention the people, who were almost without number, it consisted of forty-six presbyters, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and janitors or doorkeepers, and fifteen hundred widows and other poor, who were all maintained by the alms and offerings of the faithful.<sup>5</sup>

## LUCIUS, TWENTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[GALLUS, VOLUSIANUS.]

[Year of Christ 252.] LUCIUS was no sooner named to succeed Cornelius, than he was apprehended and sent, with many others, into banishment; for St. Cyprian wrote him a letter, in the name of his colleagues and his own, congratulating him, at the same time, on his promotion and his exile, as appears from St. Cyprian's second letter to him;<sup>4</sup> for his first has not reached our times. Lucius had been but a very short time in banishment, when he was recalled, to the inexpressible joy of his flock, who, it seems, crowded out to meet him.<sup>5</sup> On this occasion St. Cyprian wrote him a second letter, still extant,<sup>6</sup> wherein he testifies the joy with which the news of his return had been received by him and his brethren in Africa. He returned to Rome

during the heat of the persecution; but what occasioned his return, we are nowhere told. St. Cyprian says, in his second letter to him, that he was perhaps recalled to be immolated in the sight of his flock, that they might be animated and encouraged by the example of his Christian constancy and resolution;<sup>3</sup> which happened accordingly; for he had not governed eight whole months, says Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> no, nor six, according to the most probable opinion, but only five and a few days, when he died a martyr; for that title is given him by St. Cyprian.<sup>5</sup> He was beheaded, say the martyrologies; but on this point the ancients are silent; and his dying in prison had given him a just claim to that title. His body is supposed to have been discovered entire, in the church of St. Cæcilia at Rome, in 1599, though the church of Roskild, in the isle of Zealand, had long before pretended to his head.<sup>6</sup>

are still extant among those of St. Cyprian, (Cypr. ep. 46, 48;) and some fragments of his fourth letter to Fabius have been transmitted to us by Eusebius. As for the letter to Lupicinus, Bishop of Vienna, which was found in the archives of that church, and published by Father Du Bosc, the Cardinals Baronius (Bar. ad ann. 255, n. 47) and Bona (Bona lit. 1, c. 3, p. 13) think it genuine; but it is, without all doubt, supposititious: for, according to Ado and Baronius himself, (Bar. ad ann. 262, n. 55,) Florentius, whom Lupicinus is supposed to have succeeded, was raised to that see in the reign of Maximus or Gordian, about the year 240, and held it till the reign of Valerian, and about the year 258, so that in 252, when Cornelius died, Lupicinus was not yet bishop. Besides, in the title of the letter, which Baronius has suppressed, Lupicinus is styled "archbishop;" which title was not known then, nor long after. The letter is therefore rejected by Launoy, (Laun. Ger. l. 4, c. 6,) and Dr. Pearson, (Pears. Cyp. ann. p. 37,) as a forged and spurious piece. Erasmus ascribes to Cornelius the Treatise on Charity, (Eras. Cyp. p. 417;) and Du Pin both that, and the other on the public shows, with the discourse against Novatian, (Du Pin, t. 1, p. 469,) which are all to be found among St. Cyprian's works.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Flor. p. 828, 830.

<sup>3</sup> Anast. c. 46, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. ep. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ep. 58.

<sup>1</sup> Pamel. prolog. in S. Cypr. p. 19.

There is a famous abbey, bearing his name, at Compeigne, in the Isle of France, where his relics and those of St. Cyprian are supposed to be kept in the same shrine. But how can we reconcile this with what we read in the council of Rheims, held in 1019, under Leo IX., viz., that the body of St. Cornelius was removed by the clergy of Compeigne, from that city to Rheims; and received there by the pope? (Conc. t. 9, p. 1033, 1042.) But, on the other hand, the council is contradicted by Aubertus de Mira, who assures us, that, in 860, the relics of Pope Cornelius were translated from the Abbey of Inde, standing about four miles south of Aix-la-Chapelle, to that of Rosnay, which is, at present, a collegiate church in Flanders, between Oudenarde and Tournay. In this church is still to be seen a shrine, supposed to contain, as appears from the inscription, the bones of St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian. (Vide Bolland. 12 Feb. p. 607. et Pamel. p. 23.)

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 58.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. ep. 67.

<sup>6</sup> Bolland. 4 Mart. p. 301, 302.



The bishops of Gaul write to Stephen. Stephen's rash conduct. He suffers himself to be imposed upon.

## STEPHEN, TWENTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[Year of Christ 253.] STEPHEN, who succeeded Lucius, in 253, soon after his election, received a letter from Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, written in the name of all his colleagues in Gaul, informing him that Marcian, Bishop of Arles, having embraced the doctrine of Novatian, had denied the communion of the church to the lapsed, even at the point of death. At the same time they wrote to St. Cyprian, and on the same subject,<sup>1</sup> not caring to come to any vigorous resolution against their colleague, without the advice and approbation of other bishops, especially of Rome and Carthage; the former being eminent for the dignity of his see, and the latter for his known zeal, piety, and learning. But Faustinus did not find in the Bishop of Rome the zeal he expected; and therefore he wrote a second letter to St. Cyprian, exhorting him to animate the others by his example;<sup>2</sup> which that zealous prelate did accordingly; for he wrote immediately to Stephen, pressing him to despatch, without delay, full and ample letters to the bishops of Gaul; that, finding themselves thus backed and supported, they might thereby be encouraged to depose Marcian, and name another in his room. It is not to be doubted but the Bishop of Carthage, who had the welfare of the church, at least, as much at heart as the Bishop of Rome, did himself what he encouraged the others to do; but I cannot positively affirm it, since his answer to Faustinus is lost. As to the issue of this affair, the ancients have left us quite in the dark.<sup>3</sup>

St. Cyprian did not doubt in the least but that Marcian would be deposed; for, in his letter to Stephen, he desires him to let him know the name of the person who should be chosen in his room, that he may not be at a loss to whom he should direct his letters and his brethren.<sup>4</sup>

Faustinus, and the other bishops of Gaul, did not apply, on this occasion, to Stephen alone, but to him, and to St. Cyprian. Why then should their applying to the Bishop of Rome be construed, as it is, by all the Roman Catholic writers, into a tacit acknowledgment of his universal jurisdiction, and not the like construction be put on their applying to the Bishop of Carthage? But, in truth, neither can bear such a construction, since the bishops of Gaul did not refer the cause of Marcian either to Stephen, or to St. Cyprian:

they wrote to both only for their advice and approbation. Stephen was backward, for reasons unknown to us, in giving his; and therefore St. Cyprian, in a letter, which he wrote on this occasion, pressed him to encourage with his letters the people of Arles, and the bishops of Gaul, to depose Marcian, and appoint another in his room.<sup>1</sup> Was not this plainly acknowledging, not in the Bishop of Rome, but in the people and clergy, the power of deposing one bishop, and appointing another in his room?

But to return to Stephen: his rash conduct had involved the churches of Spain in endless calamities, had not St. Cyprian, and the other bishops of Africa, zealously interposed. The bishops of Spain, having judged two of their colleagues unworthy of the episcopacy, namely, Basilides of Leon and Astorga, and Martial of Merida, had disposed of their sees to others, appointing Sabinus in the room of the former, and Felix in that of the latter. They were both Libellatici, and guilty of many other crimes, for which Martial had been deposed; but Basilides, returning to himself, and conscious of his own guilt, had voluntarily resigned, declaring he should think it a great happiness to be readmitted, after due satisfaction, to the communion of the church, even in the capacity of a layman. But, ambition getting the better of all his good resolutions, he soon began to pant after his former condition; and, thinking the favour and interest of the Bishop of Rome might greatly contribute to his re-establishment, he undertook a journey to that city; and there, as St. Cyprian expresses himself, "imposed upon our colleague Stephen, who lived at a great distance, and was ignorant of the truth, seeking unjustly to be restored to his bishopric, from which he had been justly deposed."<sup>2</sup> Being thus admitted to the communion of the Bishop of Rome, he returned well satisfied to Spain, and there exercised all episcopal functions, as he had formerly done. St. Cyprian does not tell us, in express terms, that Martial too had recourse to Rome; but that he had, may, perhaps, be gathered from his words; for he writes, that, notwithstanding the craft and deceit Martial had used, probably in imposing upon Stephen, he had not been able to preserve his episcopacy.<sup>3</sup> Besides, he acted as a bishop after he had been deposed by a synod; which he would have hardly attempted, had he not been countenanced by some bishop of rank and dignity. Be that as it will, the churches of Leon, Astorga, and Merida, applied, in this their distress, to the

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Marcian's name is not in the list of the bishops of Arles, published by F. Mabillon: whence some modern writers have concluded, that he was actually deposed; but that list is very imperfect, the names of many bishops being wanting there, whom we certainly know to have governed that church.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. ep. 67.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 70.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 68.



**Martial of Merida excommunicated.** Appeals to Rome, no proof of the Pope's supremacy. Dispute about the baptism of heretics. Both opinions erroneous. The custom of baptizing heretics.

bishops of Africa, imploring, both by letters and deputies, their advice and assistance. The deputies were the two new bishops Felix and Sabinus; and their deputation was backed by a pressing letter from Felix, Bishop of Saragosa, whom St. Cyprian styles a propagator of the faith, and a defender of the truth.<sup>1</sup> These letters being read at Carthage, in a council of twenty-eight bishops, with St. Cyprian at their head, it was concluded, that Basilides and Martial ought not to be acknowledged as bishops; that it was not lawful to communicate with them; that such bishops as did, ought to be excommunicated themselves; and, finally, that their imposing upon Stephen, instead of giving them any kind of right to the sees they had forfeited by their wickedness, added to their guilt. By the same council, the election of Sabinus and Felix was confirmed, and they acknowledged by all the African bishops as their colleagues.<sup>2</sup>

It is surprising, that Bellarmine, Baronius, Davidius, and other advocates for the pope's supremacy, should lay so much stress as they do on the recourse to Rome of the two deposed bishops. If their recurring, or appealing, as they are pleased to style it, to the Bishop of Rome, is any proof of his being acknowledged by them for the head of the church, the appeal of the other bishops of Spain from him to St. Cyprian, and their acquiescing to his, and not to the judgment of Stephen, will be a stronger proof of St. Cyprian's being acknowledged by them for the head of the church. Had Basilides and Martial recurred not to Rome, but to Carthage; had the bishops of Spain appealed from St. Cyprian to Stephen, as they did from Stephen to St. Cyprian, and acquiesced to his judgment, no notice had been taken of the appeal of the two apostates; that only of the catholic bishops had been set forth with great pomp and flourish of words. But, as the case stands, they must be satisfied with the evidence of the apostates, and leave the catholic bishops to bear testimony for us, which we shall not misuse; we shall not build upon it the supremacy of the church of Carthage; we shall not set up St. Cyprian for a judge, to whose tribunal all appeals must be brought; in short, we shall not make him an universal judge, an universal pastor, a pope; though, to the testimony of the Spanish bishops, that of Gregory Nazianzene should be added, and I defy the champions for the see of Rome to allege one in their favor more plain and expressive: St. Cyprian, says he, "presided not only over the church of Carthage, or that of Africa, on which he reflected an extraordinary lustre, but over all the west, nay, and over all the nations of the east, of the north, and the south."<sup>3</sup> Had Gregory said as much of the Bishop of Rome, the passage had been employed as a corner-

stone to support the pope's universal jurisdiction.

Not long after the affair of the Spanish bishops, that is, about the year 256, according to the most probable opinion, happened the famous contest about the baptism of heretics, which rent the whole church into two parties, the one headed by St. Cyprian, and the other by Stephen. St. Cyprian maintained, that baptism administered by heretics was null and invalid; and, consequently, that such as came over from them, from what sect soever they came, ought to be baptized by a catholic minister: he owned there was but one baptism, and therefore avoided the word rebaptization; but thought that heretics had not the power of conferring it. On the other hand, Stephen, and those who adhered to him, pretended, that baptism conferred by heretics, of whatever sect or persuasion, was valid; so that by avoiding one error, they fell into another; for some heretics of those times, namely, the Montanists and Marcionites, did not baptize, as is commanded by the gospel, in the name of the Three Persons; whence their baptism was declared null by two oecumenical councils, as I shall relate hereafter. I know great pains have been taken to excuse Stephen; but his own words, quoted by St. Cyprian, from his own letter to him, can, in my opinion, admit of no dispute; for he there forbids, in express terms, the baptizing of heretics, "from what heresy soever they should come."<sup>1</sup> And here we may observe, by the way, that the whole church erred, either at this time, or afterwards; for afterwards both opinions were condemned, and both were held at this time, by the one or the other of the two parties, into which the whole church was divided. The point in dispute had been canvassed long before, and differently settled in different provinces. The churches of Africa and Numidia had formerly admitted heretics, without baptizing or rebaptizing them; but the contrary practice was established in a council of the bishops of these two provinces, summoned about the close of the second century, by Agrippinus bishop of Carthage.<sup>2</sup> The same practice of baptizing heretics was followed by the churches of Cappadocia, and the other provinces of Asia, as a tradition handed down to them from the apostles' times; whence it was confirmed in a council, which was held at Iconium in Phrygia, about the year 230, and consisted of all the bishops of Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and the neighbouring provinces.<sup>3</sup> The same practice was approved of by another council, assembled, much about the same time, at Synnades in Phrygia.<sup>4</sup> The bishops of Pontus and Egypt agreed, it seems, with those of Cappadocia and Galatia; but all the other bishops, especially those of Italy, Gaul, and Spain, held the contrary opinion, and

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Greg. Naz. orat. 18, p. 281.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 70, 73.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. ep. 70, 73; Aug. bapt. l. 2, c. 7 & 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 75.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 7.



St. Cyprian's famous letter to Jubaianus. His desire to live in peace and unity with those who held the opposite opinion. Stephen's pride and arrogance.

followed the opposite practice.<sup>1</sup> This disagreement, both in opinion and practice, had hitherto created no disturbance in the church, each bishop conforming to the custom of his particular church, as received by tradition, or settled by synods, without censuring those who disagreed with him, or being censured by them. But the question was now revived by eighteen bishops of Numidia, who wrote to a council, held at this time by St. Cyprian, to know whether they had done well in rebaptizing heretics, agreeably to the ancient practice of their respective churches. What raised this doubt now, we know not; but it is certain, the council answered, that they ought to follow the practice which they had hitherto observed.<sup>2</sup> The same answer was returned by St. Cyprian, to Quintus bishop of Mauritania, who had asked the same question.<sup>3</sup> Soon after, another council was held at Carthage, composed of seventy-one bishops, wherein the decrees of the former council, concerning the baptism of heretics, were confirmed; and besides, it was ordained, that such presbyters and deacons as had received ordination at the hands of heretics, or who, after receiving orders in the church, had fallen into heresy, should be admitted to communion only as laymen.<sup>4</sup> The council, by a synodal letter, acquainted Stephen with these resolutions, hoping he would approve and embrace them; but at the same time declaring, that if any bishop should think fit to reject them, and follow different opinions, agreeably to the liberty they all claimed, no breach of peace and unity should thence follow on their side.<sup>5</sup> With this letter St. Cyprian sent those he had written to Quintus, and to the bishops of Numidia.<sup>6</sup>

It was after this council, and before Stephen's answer, that St. Cyprian wrote the famous letter to Jubaianus, who was a bishop, but in what province, or of what city, we know not. Jubaianus had, by a letter, asked St. Cyprian's opinion about the baptizing of heretics; and, at the same time, sent him the copy of a letter, which he had received, wherein many reasons were alleged to prove that baptism, by whomsoever administered, not even the Marcionites excepted, ought to be deemed valid. The author of this letter inveighs bitterly against St. Cyprian, and those of his party, styling them "betrayers of the truth, and enemies to the peace and unity of the church."<sup>7</sup> Baronius, and likewise Pamelius, ascribe that piece to Stephen, not apprised that they must consequently own the doctrine held by Stephen to have been no less erroneous than that which was held by St. Cyprian, if the doctrine of the church be true, as I have observed above. But we have not sufficient grounds to suppose Stephen the author of it, since many besides him wrote in

favor of that opinion. St. Cyprian, in answer to Jubaianus, sent him his letter to Quintus, that of the first council to the bishops of Numidia; and, moreover, wrote him a long letter with a great many arguments in favour of his opinion, and the answers to what was objected against it; especially in the letter, whereof Jubaianus had transmitted him a copy.<sup>1</sup> He ends his letter by a most solemn protestation of unity and charity with those who should differ from him; which is related at length by St. Jerom,<sup>2</sup> and likewise by St. Austin, who tells us, that he was never tired with reading over and over again those words of peace and charity, breathing nothing but the sweetest odour of that union in which the holy prelate anxiously sought to live with his brethren.<sup>3</sup> To this letter Jubaianus returned answer, that he had fully convinced him, and that he willingly embraced his opinion.<sup>4</sup> In that letter St. Cyprian seems to have mustered all the arguments that could be alleged in favor of his opinion; and therefore St. Austin has employed his third, fourth, and fifth books on baptism, in confuting them.

We have hitherto seen with how much temper, moderation, and candor, the dispute was managed on St. Cyprian's side: he determined nothing without the advice and approbation of his colleagues assembled in council; the determinations of the council he imparted to other bishops, leaving them at full liberty to embrace or reject them, and declaring, that no disagreement in opinion should occasion in him the least breach of charity. How different was the conduct of the Bishop of Rome! He condescended, indeed, to answer the synodal letter of the African bishops; but did it with that pride and arrogance that in after ages became the characteristic of his successors. He begins with the dignity of his see, and his pretended succession to St. Peter, which he takes care to put them in mind of: in the next place, he rejects their decrees with the utmost indignation, and attempts to confute the arguments alleged to support them: he then proceeds to commands and menaces, ordering St. Cyprian to quit his opinion, and threatening to cut off, from the communion of the church, all those who should presume to differ from him, and rebaptize heretics: he concludes his letter with a bitter invective against St. Cyprian, branding that great luminary of the church with the reproachful names of "false Christ, false apostle, deceitful workman."<sup>5</sup> Such was Pope Stephen's answer to a most respectful letter from a council of seventy-one bishops. Pompeius, Bishop of Sabrata, in the Tripolitana, hearing of this letter, and being desirous to peruse it, as he had done all the rest on the same subject, St. Cyprian, in compliance with his desire, sent him a copy of it; and at

<sup>1</sup> Basil. ep. 75.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ep. 71.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ep. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. ep. 70.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ep. 73.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ep. 73.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 73.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. bapt. l. 4, c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 74; Euseb. l. 7, c. 3; Aug. bapt. l. 2, c. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. in Luc. c. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Concil. p. 397.



Stephen censured by St. Cyprian. St. Cyprian assembles a great council at Carthage. Deputies sent to Stephen. He excommunicates all who held the opposite opinion. His conduct disapproved by Dionysius.

the same time wrote him a letter, wherein he treats Stephen, upon the just provocation he had given him, with more than ordinary sharpness and acrimony, charging him with "pride and impertinence," with "self-contradiction and ignorance," with "indiscretion, obstinacy, childishness;" nay, he styles him a "favorer and abetter of heretics against the church of God."<sup>1</sup> St. Cyprian was more provoked at Stephen's abusive language than moved either by his authority or menaces. St. Austin supposes the opinion he held to have been false and erroneous; and yet owns that he was not obliged to yield to the authority of Stephen, nor give up the point till he was convinced by dint of reason, or by the decision of an oecumenical council.<sup>2</sup> However, as St. Cyprian sought nothing but truth, upon the receipt of Stephen's letter, he summoned a great council, in order to have the question canvassed anew, and examined with more care and attention. The council met accordingly, on the 1st of September, 256, consisting of eighty-five bishops, a great number of presbyters and deacons, and a considerable part of the people.<sup>3</sup> To this assembly were read the letter of Jubaianus to St. Cyprian, his answer to it, and Jubaianus's reply; with the letter of the former council to Stephen, and Stephen's answer to the council. These pieces being read, St. Cyprian made a short discourse, exhorting his colleagues to speak their mind freely: the words he used on this occasion alluded, without doubt, to the pride and arrogance of the Bishop of Rome; "Let none of us," says he, "set up for the bishop of bishops; let none of us presume to reduce our colleagues by a tyrannical fear to the necessity of obeying:" he concluded with protesting anew, in the most solemn manner, that he left every one the full liberty of following what opinion he liked best; and that no man should, on that score, be judged by him, or separated from his communion.<sup>4</sup> The discourse being finished, each bishop delivered his opinion, and St. Cyprian the last, all approving, with one consent, the baptizing of heretics. Pamelius and others count eighty-seven bishops present at the council, because Natalis of Oea spoke for the two other bishops of Libya Tripolitana, namely, Pompeius of Sabrata, and Dioga of Leptis the Great,<sup>5</sup> who were absent.

The third council of Carthage having thus confirmed the decrees of the two former, notwithstanding the threats and menaces of the Bishop of Rome, it was thought advisable for the peace of the church to acquaint him therewith; and at the same time to inform him more particularly of the reasons on which their opinion was grounded. Deputies were accordingly despatched to Rome for that pur-

pose; but Stephen not only refused to see or hear them, but would not allow any of his flock to correspond with them, to supply them with the necessaries of life, or even to admit them under the same roof; excluding them not only from his communion, but from common hospitality, says Firmilian, who wrote this very year.<sup>1</sup> He did not stop here; but, transported with rage, or zeal, as Baronius is pleased to style it, he cut off from his communion all the bishops who had assisted at the council, and all those who held the same opinion, that is, the bishops of Africa, Numidia, Mauritania, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Egypt.<sup>2</sup> But Stephen's anathemas proved, as those of Victor had done before, *bruta fulmina*; no regard was had to them, no, not even by those of his own party; who, by continuing in communion with those whom he had cut off from his, sufficiently declared their thoughts touching his rash and unchristian conduct. This dispute, says St. Austin, occasioned no schism in the church, the bishops continuing united in charity, notwithstanding their disagreement in opinion.<sup>3</sup> No thanks to Stephen, who did all that lay in his power to set the bishops at variance, and involve the whole church in confusion and disorder: "The peace of Christ," continues St. Austin, "triumphed in their hearts, and put a stop to the growing schism;" not in the heart of Stephen, where rage, ambition, and envy lodged; guests incompatible with peace and charity; but in the hearts of the other bishops, who were thereby restrained from following his example. How many schisms had been prevented, had bishops in after ages trod in the footsteps of those great prelates!

Dionysius, afterwards pope, and Philemon, both then presbyters of the church of Rome, acquainted, no doubt by Stephen's direction, the great Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, with what had passed, hoping to gain him over to their party, and extort from him an approbation of Stephen's conduct: but that illustrious prelate, foreseeing and well weighing the evil consequences that might attend it, declared his sentiments with all the freedom and zeal that became a man of his rank in the church. He told them plainly, that the condemning a practice which had been established by so many councils was what he could by no means approve of; that an affair of such consequence required long and mature deliberation; and that the deciding it over hastily might raise eternal disputes, and end at last in a schism: he therefore begged Stephen, in a letter which he wrote to him on this occasion, that he would, upon reflection, alter his conduct; and in an affair upon which so much depended, take different measures from those which he had hitherto pursued.<sup>4</sup> As Stephen wrote to Dionysius, so did St. Cyprian to Firmilian, giving him a particular

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de bapt. l. 1, c. 7, 18, et l. 2, c. 8, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. con. p. 397.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. Aug. de bapt. l. 3, c. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. con. p. 403.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 75.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. bapt. l. 5, c. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.



Stephen severely censured by Firmilian. He dies, but not a Martyr. His Acts fabulous. His relics. Dionysius of Alexandria interposes in the famous dispute. Peace restored to the church by his means.

and candid account both of Stephen's conduct and his own. Firmilian was Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church both for piety and learning: he had a singular veneration for St. Cyprian, maintained with great zeal the same cause, and consequently had been equally ill-used and excommunicated by Stephen. He therefore received with extraordinary joy the letter, which St. Cyprian sent him by Rogatian, one of his deacons, often read it with great satisfaction,<sup>1</sup> and answered it with a long letter,<sup>2</sup> which is still extant, though St. Cyprian's to him has been lost long since. In this letter Firmilian, amazed and provoked at Stephen's unaccountable conduct, expresses his detestation of it in sharper terms than the laws of charity can well allow; for, not content to charge him with sacrificing the peace of the church to a petulant humour, he compares him to Judas, and stigmatizes him with the epithets of inhuman, audacious, insolent, wicked, impious schismatic; for "he is a true schismatic," says Firmilian, "who departs from the unity of the church, which thou hast done, O Stephen; for, by attempting to separate others from thee, thou hast separated thyself from all other churches. How much sin hast thou heaped upon thyself by cutting thyself off from so many flocks!"<sup>3</sup> Firmilian's letter was translated into Latin by St. Cyprian himself, as is manifest from the style. It was unknown, it seems, to St. Austin; for he never quotes it, nor, in confuting the opinion of St. Cyprian, takes any notice of some reasons alleged in that letter to support it.

There was no hope of seeing an end put to this dispute, so long as Stephen lived; but he dying, his successor, who was a man of a quite different temper, laid the storm, which his furious and ungovernable passion had raised. He died on the 2d of August, 257, according to the most probable opinion.<sup>4</sup> The Church of Rome, upon the authority of his Acts, ranks him among the martyrs; but that

honor is not paid him either by St. Austin, or by Vincentius Lirinensis, who, naming him together with St. Cyprian, as they often do, give constantly the title of Martyr to the latter, and never to the former. As for his Acts, they flatly contradict, in several points, the most unexceptionable writers among the ancients,<sup>1</sup> and therefore by no means deserve the credit which Baronius would have us give them.<sup>2</sup> Even Anastasius seems to have made no account of them, if in his time they were yet composed, which may be questioned; for the account he gives us of Stephen's death differs widely from that which we read in those Acts.<sup>3</sup> But he had made a bold attempt towards extending the power and authority of the see of Rome, and therefore was to be placed among the saints for the encouragement of others. To say he had merited that honour by his virtues, either as a Christian or a bishop, had been carrying the imposture too far: the only means therefore left of making him a saint, was to make him a martyr, that, by his glorious death, he might be thought to have deserved what it was manifest from the records of those times he had not deserved by his Christian life. Hence Acts were forged, setting forth his heroic confession of the faith before the emperor, his sufferings on that account, the stupendous miracles he wrought, &c., which, however incredible, might, in process of time, by their antiquity alone, gain credit with the greater part of mankind. Stephen was buried in the cemetery of Callistus;<sup>4</sup> whence his body was translated about the year 762, by Paul I., to a monastery of Greek monks, which that pope had built in Rome, as we read in Anastasius.<sup>5</sup> How it got from thence to Trani in Apulia, nobody knows; but from that city it was conveyed with great pomp in 1782, to Pisa in Tuscany, where it is still worshipped in a church bearing the pretended saint's name.<sup>6</sup> According to the most probable opinion, Stephen governed four years, and about six months.

## SIXTUS II., TWENTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[VALERIAN, GALLIENUS.]

Year of Christ 257.] STEPHEN being dead, Sixtus or Xystus II., a deacon of the church of Rome, was chosen to succeed him. As the late dispute was not yet ended, Dionysius bishop of Alexandria no sooner heard of his promotion, than he began to press him with great earnestness to relinquish the wild pretensions of his predecessor, and concur with the other bishops in restoring peace and

tranquillity to the church.<sup>7</sup> He wrote three letters to him on the same subject, whereof the last was from Dionysius and the whole church of Alexandria, to Sixtus and the whole church of Rome.<sup>8</sup> He wrote likewise to Dionysius and Philemon, two presbyters of the church of Rome, whom we have men-

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 75.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 297.

<sup>5</sup> Pears. annal. Cypr. p. 57, 58.

<sup>6</sup> Bar. ad ann. 259.

<sup>7</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 267.

<sup>8</sup> Boll. Pont. p. 36.

<sup>9</sup> Idem c. 9.

<sup>10</sup> Anast. in vit. Vict.

<sup>11</sup> Anast. c. 95.

<sup>12</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 5, 9.



Valerian persecutes the church. Sixtus martyred. The see vacant almost a whole year. Dionysius's charity to the distressed Christians of Cæsarea.

tioned above, and who upon Stephen's death seem to have abandoned his party; for Dionysius of Alexandria, in his first letter to Sixtus, writes, that these two presbyters had been formerly of Stephen's opinion<sup>1</sup>—a plain indication that they were not then. The Bishop of Alexandria had at last the satisfaction to see his pious endeavours crowned with success; for we find no farther mention made of this dispute till it was revived by the Donatists. In what manner it ended, we are nowhere told; but it is manifest, from the writers of those times, that the African and Asiatic bishops continued the same practice of baptizing heretics, till it was condemned by the two great councils, of Arles in 314, and of Nice in 325.<sup>2</sup> Whence we may well conclude, that the terms proposed at the beginning of the dispute by Dionysius and St. Cyprian were agreed to by Sixtus, namely, that no restraint should be laid on the bishops of either side, but that every one should be allowed to follow undisturbed which of the two opinions he thought most agreeable to the Scriptures and to reason. This was allowing the bishops to consult the Scriptures, and make use of their own reason, in a point

already judged and decided by the Bishop of Rome. But the successors of Sixtus have not been so complaisant; for they pretend, that a blind faith ought to be yielded to all their decisions as infallibly true, a blind obedience to all their decrees as unquestionably holy.

But now the persecution, which had begun some months before the decease of Stephen, raged with more violence than ever: for Valerian having, at the instigation of an Egyptian magician, changed the kindness he once had for the Christians into an implacable hatred, he ordered, by a rescript to the senate, all bishops, priests, and deacons, to be carefully sought for, and executed without mercy.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to this order, Sixtus, who among the first fell into the hands of the persecutors, was immediately either beheaded, as we read in the pontifical of Bucherius;<sup>2</sup> or crucified, as we are told by Prudentius;<sup>3</sup> having held the chair only eleven months and some days. Pontius, a deacon of the church of Carthage, styles him a good and pacific prelate,<sup>4</sup> no doubt on account of his conduct quite opposite to that of his ambitious and quarrelsome predecessor.<sup>5</sup>

## DIONYSIUS, TWENTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[GALLIENUS, CLAUDIUS II.]

[Year of Christ 258.] SIXTUS being dead, and the Christians prevented by the persecution from assembling to choose another in his room, the see remained vacant almost a whole year, that is, from the 6th of August, 258, to the 22d of July, 259, when Dionysius, a presbyter of the church of Rome, whom we have mentioned above, was elected, to the great satisfaction of the faithful; for he was one of the most eminent men of his time both for piety and learning.<sup>3</sup> During his pontificate, the Goths broke into the empire, overran all Asia Minor, and, having almost utterly destroyed the city of Cæsarea, they carried with them into captivity most of its Christian inhabitants. Firmilian was then bishop of the place, who had censured the conduct of Stephen with so much sharpness and acrimony; but the remembrance of what had passed on that unhappy occasion had not that effect on Dionysius, which far less provocations have had on many of his successors; for he no sooner heard of the distress that church was in, than, laying hold of so favorable an opportunity to exert his charity, he wrote a letter to comfort them in their calamity, and

at the same time despatched proper persons with large collections to ransom the Christians who had fallen into the hands of the barbarians.<sup>6</sup> The letter, which Dionysius wrote on this occasion, was carefully kept in the archives of the church of Cæsarea, as an authentic monument of his goodness and charity.<sup>7</sup> The great Dionysius bishop of Alexandria having, at this time, composed a learned treatise to prove against Sabellius the distinction of the divine persons, some overzealous Catholics, misconstruing several passages in that work, and concluding that he had run into the opposite error, accused him

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Buch. p. 268.

<sup>3</sup> Prud. de coron. martyr. p. 71.

<sup>4</sup> Pont. in vit. S. Cypr. p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Rufinus published, under the name of Sixtus bishop of Rome, the book of a Pythagorean philosopher, named Sixtus. St. Jerom reproaches him in two places with that imposture, as he styles it, supposing him to have known the work, which he ascribed to Pope Sixtus, not to be his. (Ep. ad Ctesiph. contr. Pelag. c. 22, et in cap. 18, Ezech.) St. Austin was imposed upon among the rest; for, in his treatise of Nature and Grace, he quotes that book as the work of Pope Sixtus; but he afterwards owned and corrected his mistake. (Aug. l. 2, retract. c. 42.) It was ranked by Pope Gelasius among the books of heretics; so that he supposed it to have been written by a Christian, which was more than he could know, there not being a single word in it whence we can argue the author to have believed in, or to have had any knowledge of Christ: and it is on this consideration that it has been thought unworthy of a bishop of those times.

<sup>6</sup> Basil. ep. 220.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. ep. 77; Basil. can. 47, et ep. 8, conc. Arel. can. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. ep. 220, et de Sp. Sanct. c. 29; Euseb. l. 7, c. 7; Athan. de syn. ep. 918.



Dionysius of Alexandria accused at Rome. That argues no jurisdiction in the Bishop of Rome. Paul, Bishop of Antioch, deposed without the knowledge of the Bishop of Rome. Keeps possession of the bishop's habitation.

to the Bishop of Rome, as if he denied the Son to be consubstantial with the Father.<sup>1</sup> Hereupon the Bishop of Rome, having assembled a council, acquainted Dionysius with the sentiments of the other bishops, and his own, expressing his concern, that the divinity of the Word should have been questioned by him, and at the same time desiring him to answer the accusation.<sup>2</sup> This Dionysius readily did in four books, which he styled Confutation and Apology; showing therein that his opinion was very different from what it had been represented at Rome, and explaining those passages which had given ground for the accusation. This work he addressed to the Bishop of Rome.<sup>3</sup> Here Baronius exults. Behold, says he, one of the most eminent prelates of the church, upon suspicion of heresy, arraigned at Rome, judged at Rome. Who does not see a supreme tribunal erected there, to which all causes must be brought; a sovereign judge residing there, by whom all persons must be absolved or condemned; is either blind and cannot see, or shuts his eyes and will not see.<sup>4</sup> And does not the sharp-sighted annalist himself see what every one the least conversant in ecclesiastical history must see, if he is not either blind and cannot, or shuts his eyes and will not see, namely, bishops, when guilty, or only suspected of heresy, accused to some of their colleagues, who neither had nor claimed any jurisdiction over them? Thus was the famous Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, at this very time, accused by his whole church, first to Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, and soon after to Firmilian bishop of Cæsarea.<sup>5</sup> That such an accusation argued any jurisdiction in those bishops over the Bishop of Antioch, is what Baronius himself dares not affirm; and yet a like accusation brought to Rome is enough for him to transform that see into a supreme tribunal; that bishop, though far from such ambitious thoughts, into a sovereign judge. But the Bishop of Rome, says Baronius, required of Dionysius a confession or declaration of his faith: and does not that argue superiority and jurisdiction? Baronius himself knew it does not: for it is impossible he should not know, that when a bishop was suspected of heresy, all his colleagues had a right to require of him a confession of his faith, and not to communicate with him till they had received it.

In the time of Dionysius was held the famous council of Antioch, which condemned and deposed Paul bishop of that city, who denied the distinction of the Divine Persons, and the divinity of Christ. Of the deposition of Paul, and the election of Damnus, who was placed in his room, notice was immediately given to the whole church, by a synodal letter addressed to Dionysius bishop of Rome,

and to Maximus, who had succeeded the great Dionysius in the see of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> And here it will not be foreign to my purpose to observe, that the Bishop of Antioch was summoned to appear before the council, and not at the supreme tribunal erected by Baronius at Rome; that he was condemned and deposed without the consent or concurrence, nay, and without the knowledge of the sovereign judge residing at Rome; that he did not appeal to him, which he certainly would have done, as he was a man of unparalleled impudence and ambition, had such a custom obtained in those days; and lastly, that the fathers of the council wrote to the Bishop of Rome in the same manner as they did to other bishops, letting him know, that for the future he was to communicate with Damnus, and not with Paul. All this is manifest from the account which St. Basil gives us of that council.<sup>2</sup> And yet Baronius brings in that father, even on this occasion, as an evidence for the papal supremacy.<sup>3</sup>

From St. Basil, Baronius runs to the Emperor Aurelian, begging of a Pagan prince what he could not extort from a catholic bishop, a declaration and acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy. The reader must know, that Paul having kept, by force, possession of the bishop's habitation in defiance of the council, the catholic bishops had recourse to the emperor, who, after hearing both parties with great attention, adjudged the house to him, who should be acknowledged by the Bishop of Rome and the other bishops of Italy.<sup>4</sup> This Baronius interprets as an open acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy; and that his readers may not overlook it, as most of them would be apt to do,

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. de synod.

<sup>3</sup> For by wrong pointing a passage in the Latin translation of that author, he makes him contradict himself, and ascribe the deposing of Paul to Dionysius bishop of Rome, and the great Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, though the latter was dead before Paul was deposed, as is evident from the letter which was written by the council on that occasion, and is addressed to Maximus the successor of Dionysius in the see of Alexandria, (Euseb. l. 7, c. 30.) The passage runs thus: *Duo enim Dionysii diu ante eos septuaginta fuere, qui Samosatensem sustulere, quorum alter Romæ, alter Alexandria Præsul erat.* (Basil. de syn. p. 918.) The meaning of St. Basil is, that the two Dionysius's flourished before the council of Antioch, which consisted of seventy bishops, and deposed Paul of Samosata; that is, before the second council that was assembled against him; for another had been convened in the same city about eight years before to depose him; but upon his pretending to renounce his errors, the sentence had been suspended. The above-quoted passage Baronius stops thus: *Duo enim Dionysii diu ante eos septuaginta fuere; qui Samosatensem deposuere, &c.*, so that the relative *qui* refers, according to this method of pointing, to the two Dionysius's, and not to the seventy bishops: as if St. Basil had said, "The two Dionysius's, who deposed Paul of Samosata, flourished before the council of Antioch, which was composed of seventy bishops." (Bar. ad ann. 265, n. 10.) So that Paul must be twice deposed, St. Basil must contradict himself, all the writers of those times must be arraigned as guilty of an unpardonable omission, lest the Bishop of Rome should appear to have been, what he really was, an idle spectator of a transaction so famous in the history of the church. A writer of any honor or honesty had rather give up a cause, than expose himself thus by attempting to defend it.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 21.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. pro sent. Dion. Alex. p. 558.

<sup>2</sup> Idem. ib. et de syn. 918, 919.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ib. p. 558, 559.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 263, n. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. l. 7 c. 27.



The emperor's sentence whether favourable to the pretensions of the see of Rome. Dionysius dies not a Martyr. Felix dies a Martyr in the persecution of Aurelian. Eutychianus not martyred.

he takes care to bespeak their attention, by marking it in the margin with the following words in capitals, "The Emperor Aurelian acknowledges the supremacy of the Church of Rome."<sup>1</sup> From this one would expect to find Aurelian not only turned Christian, but prostrate at his Holiness's feet, and bowing down to kiss them: but our annalist, to the great disappointment of his readers, after having thus raised their attention, only repeats out of Eusebius the sentence pronounced by the emperor, which he would have us suppose with him to have been owing to the knowledge that prince had of the pope's supremacy. And why must the pope's supremacy be brought in here rather than the supremacy of the bishops of Ravenna, of Milan, of Aquileia, &c., and, above all, the supremacy of the collective body of the Italian bishops? for to them, and not to any particular bishop, the cause was referred by the emperor. As for the emperor's conduct on this occasion, it may be thus accounted for: that just and wise prince observed the bishops in the east greatly animated against Paul; and therefore apprehending them more swayed by passion and prejudice than by justice and equity, he referred the cause to

the bishops of Italy, who, he thought, would judge more impartially, as being placed at a distance, and not engaged, at least not so warmly, in the dispute.<sup>1</sup> But this happened two years after the death of Dionysius; for he died on the 26th of December, 269. Claudius and Paternus being consuls, after having governed the church of Rome for the space of ten years, five months, and four days, according to the most probable opinion.<sup>2</sup> As he died in the reign of Claudius II., surnamed the Gothic, who is represented in the Acts of some pretended martyrs as an implacable enemy to the Christian name, he is in some martyrologies honored with the title of Martyr; but as neither Eusebius, nor any other ancient writer, takes notice of that prince's having ever persecuted or molested the Christians, those Acts ought to be looked upon as fabulous, and Dionysius, with three hundred and seventy-five more, expunged out of the catalogue of martyrs; though some of them, namely, Marcus, Priscus, Valentine, and Quirinus, are honored by the Church of Rome as saints of the first class, and have filled with their relics most of the provinces of Europe.

## FELIX, TWENTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CLAUDIUS II., AURELIAN.]

[Year of Christ 269.] DIONYSIUS was succeeded by Felix, in whose times a furious persecution being raised by Aurelian, he may be supposed to have suffered among the rest, since he is distinguished by the council of Ephesus,<sup>2</sup> by St. Cyril,<sup>3</sup> and by Vincentius Lirinensis,<sup>4</sup> with the title of Martyr. He presided, according to Eusebius,<sup>5</sup> Syncellus,<sup>6</sup> and Eutychius,<sup>7</sup> five years, to which Baronius adds eleven months and twenty-five days.<sup>8</sup>

He wrote a letter addressed to Maximus bishop of Alexandria, which is quoted by Cyril, and the council of Ephesus.<sup>3</sup> The Acts of the Martyrs, who are supposed to have suffered under Aurelian, are without all doubt supposititious; for in them frequent mention is made of the emperor's son, whereas the writers of those times tell us in express terms, that he had a daughter, but no male issue.<sup>4</sup>

## EUTYCHIANUS, TWENTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[AURELIAN, TACITUS, PROBUS, CARUS.]

[Year of Christ 275.] FELIX being dead, Eutychianus was chosen in his room in the very beginning of the year 275.<sup>9</sup> Several things are said of him by Anastasius and

other writers of no authority; but all I can learn of the ancients concerning him is, that he governed eight years and eleven months;<sup>5</sup> and consequently died in the close of the year 283. He is honored by the Church of Rome as a martyr, and is said in the Roman mar-

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 272, n. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 3, p. 511.

<sup>3</sup> Vin. Lirin. c. 42.

<sup>4</sup> Sync. p. 385.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. 272.

<sup>6</sup> Cyr. ib.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 32.

<sup>8</sup> Eutych. p. 400.

<sup>9</sup> Euseb. l. 7, c. 32; Buch. p. 272.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Du Pin de antiq. ecc. discip. dissert. 2, p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> Conc. t. 3, p. 511, 851.

<sup>4</sup> Aur. vit. p. 223.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. p. 272.



Caius not a Martyr, though honoured as a Martyr. The Church of Rome, why so fond of Martyrs. Marcellinus unjustly aspersed by the Church of Rome.

tyrology to have suffered under Numerian; but it is certain that in 283, when Eutychianus died, Numerian was not emperor, but only Cæsar, and at that very time engaged with his father, Carus, in a war with the Persians in the east, where he was assassinated by Aper, his father-in-law. As for his brother, Carinus, who remained in the west, neither he,

nor the two preceding emperors, Tacitus and Probus, ever gave the least disturbance to the Christians; so that the Church of Rome must be at the trouble of finding out a distinct place in heaven from that of the martyrs for Eutychianus, Trophimus, Sabbacius, and the illustrious senator Dorymedon, who are supposed to have suffered under those princes.

## CAIUS, TWENTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CARUS, CARINUS, NUMERIAN, DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN.]

[Year of Christ 283.] As little is said by the ancients of Caius as is said of his predecessor. A few days after the death of Eutychianus, Caius was chosen to succeed him, Carus and Carinus being consuls.<sup>1</sup> He presided twelve years, four months, and seven days; that is, from the 17th of December, 283, to the 22d of April, 296. Caius too is counted by the Church of Rome among her martyrs, upon the authority of Bede, and of the Acts of St. Susanna, by which that writer seems to have been misled. In those Acts, Caius is said to have suffered with Susanna, his niece, and many others, under Numerian: but that prince in his father's lifetime had no great power, being only Cæsar, and very young, and was killed on his march out of Persia soon after his father's death; so that he never reigned in the west, and but a very short time in the east.

Caius therefore could not suffer under him at Rome, where his elder brother Carinus governed. But the vulgar have a particular veneration for martyrs, and, what turns to a very good account, are glad to purchase their relics at any rate. The Church of Rome, therefore, to provide herself with great store of them, has multiplied beyond belief the number of her martyrs; which she could not well do without multiplying at the same time the number of the persecutors of the Christian religion. And hence it is that several princes, who never molested, nay, who greatly favored the Christians, have been by the Church of Rome transformed in her martyrologies and legends into persecutors. As for the Acts of the supposed St. Susanna, they are full of mistakes and absurdities, and contradict the best historians of those times.

## MARCELLINUS, TWENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, GALERIUS.]

[Year of Christ 296.] MARCELLINUS succeeded Caius on the 30th of June, 296, and governed eight years, three months, and twenty-five days, according to the most ancient records:<sup>2</sup> so that he must have died on the 24th of October, 304. The love of truth, which an historian ought never to swerve from, obliges me to undertake the defence of this pope against the Church of Rome herself, and most of her divines, who, joining the Donatists of Africa, have endeavoured to blacken his memory with aspersions equally wicked and groundless. For the Church of Rome tells us, both in her Breviary and Martyrology, and her divines must chime in with her, that Marcellinus being apprehended during the persecution of Dioclesian, he was persuaded by that prince to deliver up the Holy Scripture to be burnt by the pagans, agree-

ably to a late edict, and at the same time to offer incense to the gods. This they found on the Acts of the council of Sinuessa, which is supposed to have been summoned on that occasion, and before which Marcellinus is said to have been convicted by seventy-two witnesses of the above-mentioned crimes. That such a scandalous story, invented by the Donatists of Africa, as St. Austin affirms,<sup>1</sup> should not only have been credited, but industriously propagated, by the successors of Marcellinus, must seem very strange and surprising to those who recollect with how much zeal they have strove on other occasions to conceal or excuse the least imperfections in their predecessors. If, therefore, they not only readily own the apostasy of Marcellinus, but are the first to divulge it, and take care to make it known in the Breviary to those who

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 272.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de bapt. c. 10.



Their view therein. Marcellinus commended by the ancients. The Acts of the council of Sinuessa fabulous. No such council ever held. The many absurdities contained in the Acts of that council.

scarce know any thing else, we may be well assured there is a snake hid in the grass; the more as it is certain almost beyond doubt, that no such council was ever held; and consequently that the Acts upon which alone that apostasy is founded, are supposititious. To unravel the whole, the reader must know, that the fall of Marcellinus made such a noise in the church, as we read in those Acts, that immediately a grand council met, composed of no fewer than three hundred bishops. Before this council Marcellinus appeared; but, at his first appearance, the bishops, struck with horror at the very thought of judging the head of the church, the judge of all, cried out with one voice, "The first see is to be judged by nobody: accuse yourself, judge yourself, condemn yourself." To this testimony, so favourable to the ambitious views of the bishops of Rome, is entirely owing the sanction which they have given to such fables, highly injurious to the memory of one of their best predecessors. Without this lenitive, the Acts of the pretended council of Sinuessa, supposing the apostasy of a pope, had been condemned; the absurdities and contradictions, which it is wholly made up of, had been set forth in a proper light; and the testimonies of Theodoret and St. Austin had been alleged to vindicate the character of Marcellinus: for of these two writers the former tells us, that he acquired great glory by his conduct during the persecution;<sup>1</sup> and the latter, in writing against Petilian, the Donatist, has the following words: "Why should I answer the calumnies with which he loads the bishops of Rome? Why should I clear them from the crimes which he lays to their charge? Marcellinus, and his presbyters Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester, are accused by him as if they had delivered up the sacred books, and offered incense to the gods: are they therefore to be thought guilty? Does he prove what he advances against them? He brands them with the epithet of wicked and sacrilegious; but I say they are innocent: And why should I produce reasons to support my defence, since he brings none to make good his charge?"<sup>2</sup> But a solemn declaration that the see of Rome "is to be judged by nobody," made in those early times, by three hundred bishops, carries with it such marks of truth, as quite invalidate the testimonies of Theodoret and St. Austin, and render the apostasy of Marcellinus, which gave room to that declaration, undeniable! St. Austin looks upon the apostasy of Marcellinus, and his presbyters Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester, who were all afterwards bishops of Rome, as a mere calumny, as an invention of the Donatists; but their successors, trampling upon all authority that stands in the way of their ambition, choose rather to have four of their predecessors thought apostates and idolaters,

than part with the decree of that pretended council, exalting them so high above all other bishops.

If Marcellinus acquired great glory during the persecution, as Theodoret assures us; if his apostasy was a mere calumny, broached by the Donatists, as we read in St. Austin; the pretended council of Sinuessa must be given up, since it is supposed to have been assembled on occasion of Marcellinus's fall: but, abstracting from the fall of Marcellinus, the circumstances attending that council are in themselves so absurd and incredible, that there needs no other argument to convince a man, who has any understanding, and dares to use it, that no such council ever was, or could be held. For who can conceive it possible, that, during the most cruel persecution the church ever suffered, three hundred bishops should assemble, not in Rome, where they might more easily have met unobserved, but in a small country town, where a much less numerous assembly must immediately have been observed and suspected? But, after the death of Fabianus, says Baronius,<sup>1</sup> the clergy of Rome, and the bishops, met to choose him a successor, notwithstanding the persecution that raged then. He ought to have said *some* bishops, as St. Cyprian does,<sup>2</sup> whom he quotes; but I shall say so for him, that his argument may appear in its full strength, and save me the trouble of answering it; for it will then run thus: Some bishops, perhaps fifteen or twenty, met unobserved in the great and populous city of Rome: *ergo*, three hundred might meet unobserved in a small country town; for such was Sinuessa.

This council is supposed to have been held in a grotto, or cave, where there was no room but for fifty at a time; and yet they are all said to have been present when Marcellinus owned his crime, and divested himself of his dignity. And what a despicable figure does he make on that occasion! At first he denies the charge; but, being convicted by seventy-two eye-witnesses, he owns it at last, but in terms more becoming a school-boy, trembling at the sight of a rod, than a penitent bishop, before so grave an assembly. But the most remarkable passage in that piece is the dispute between Urbanus high-pontiff of Jupiter, and Marcellinus high-pontiff of the Christians. Urbanus, to convince his fellow-pontiff that he ought not to scruple offering incense to Jupiter, alleges the example of the magi offering incense to Christ. Marcellinus answers, that the offering of incense on that occasion was mysterious; and unravels the mystery. Hereupon Urbanus, unacquainted with mysteries, appeals to the judgment of the emperors Dioclesian and Maximian; to this appeal Marcellinus agrees; and the controversy is referred by both pontiffs to be decided by the two emperors. They, no doubt,

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 2, p. 524.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. in Pet. c. 16, t. 7, p. 87.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 303, n. 102, 105.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. ep. 31.



Marcellinus falsely supposed to have died a Martyr. Vacancy of three years. Marcellinus and Marcellus confounded by some writers; but distinguished by others.

gave sentence in favour of Jupiter and Urbanus; and then Dioclesian, taking Marcellinus with him into the temple of Vesta, persuaded him there to offer incense to Jupiter, Hercules, and Saturn. How these three deities came to have a place in the temple of Vesta, the compiler of these Acts alone knows. Such are the absurdities and contradictions, of which that piece is wholly made up. But it flatters the ambition of the successors of Marcellinus; on occasion of his fall it exalts the see of Rome above all other sees: its authority therefore must not be called in question: all the absurdities and contradictions it contains must be blindly believed; the memory of Marcellinus most unjustly slandered; the testimonies of Theodoret, and St. Austin, clearing him from all guilt, disregarded and rejected. And may not this be interpreted as a tacit declaration, that they had rather he had been guilty than innocent, provided his guilt could anyways contribute to the aggrandizing of their see? What can we think their ambition will spare, since they have thus sacrificed to it the character of one of their predecessors, whose memory is revered by all antiquity? The Church of Rome honours Marcellinus as a saint; and, notwithstanding his pretended apostasy, allows him a place amongst her martyrs; probably by way of reparation for the injustice done him. But his martyrdom may be justly questioned; at least it seems to have been utterly unknown to St. Austin, who flourished not long after his time, since he never mentions it, though it would have afforded him the strongest argument he could possibly use to silence the Donatists. His martyrdom, it is true, is vouched by Bede, who tells us, that he was beheaded at Rome, by Dioclesian's order; but that historian is often led into gross mistakes by a pontifical,

supposed to have been written in the sixth century, which he frequently copies, with all its anachronisms and other faults.

That, upon the death of Marcellinus, there happened a vacancy of some years, seems undeniable, since it is marked in the pontificals, even in that of Bucherius,<sup>1</sup> and mentioned by all those who, till Baronius's time, have written the history of the popes: but what at this time should occasion a vacancy at least of three years, is what I will not take upon me to account for: the persecution lasted but two years in Italy, according to Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> which expired soon after the death of Marcellinus: some pretend that it raged there so long as Galerius was master of that country. Be that as it will, it is certain, that Maxentius usurped the empire in 306, and that he not only favoured the Christians, but pretended to be of the same religion himself; and yet the see remained vacant, according to the pontifical of Bucherius,<sup>3</sup> till the tenth consulate of Maximian Hercules, and the seventh of Maximian Galerius, that is, till the year 308. Baronius indeed admits of no vacancy; but, in opposition to all those who have written before him, places the election of Marcellus immediately after the decease of his predecessor Marcellinus.<sup>4</sup> This I should readily agree to, but for the authority of the above-mentioned pontifical, which had not yet appeared in Baronius's time, and is thought to have been written about the year 354. As for the Chronicle of Eusebius, it can be here of no weight on the one side or the other, since Marcellus is there quite left out; and his successor Melchiades is said to have died before Constantine made himself master of Rome; whereas it is certain, that, under Melchiades, a council was held at Rome, by that prince's order, as we shall see hereafter.

## MARCELLUS, TWENTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, GALERIUS, CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 308.] UPON the death of Marcellinus, the see remained vacant somewhat above three years and a half; that is, from the 24th of October, 304, to the 19th of May, 308, when Marcellus was chosen in his room. Thus, says the pontifical of Bucherius, where, instead of seven years, which is a mistake of the transcribers, as is manifest from the consulships marked there, we must read three.<sup>1</sup> The similitude of the two names has misled some writers to confound Marcellinus with Marcellus; for Eusebius as well as St. Jerom only mention the former; and

Theodoret, omitting both Marcellus and Eusebius, who succeeded him, names Melchiades as the immediate successor of Marcellinus;<sup>5</sup> which has made Dr. Pearson doubt, whether Marcellus was ever Bishop of Rome.<sup>6</sup> But Marcellinus and Marcellus are evidently distinguished in the pontifical of Bucherius, by the different times in which they governed, and the different consuls under whom their government began and ended.<sup>7</sup> They are, besides, distinguished both by Optatus

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> Buch. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 8, c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 304, n. 26, 27.

<sup>6</sup> Pears. post, 109.

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 272.



Marcellus is banished. His Acts are fabulous. His relics. Eusebius defends the discipline of the church, and is banished. Constantine converted to the Christian religion. His edicts in favour of the Christians.

Milevitanus,<sup>1</sup> and St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> who speaks of Marcellus, not only as a presbyter of the Church of Rome, but as bishop of that see. To these testimonies I may add the epitaph of Marcellus by Pope Damasus, supposing him to have been Bishop of Rome.<sup>3</sup> Damasus flourished about the year 366. Many things are said of Marcellus; but they are all founded either on his Acts, or the modern pontificals, and consequently have no foundation at all. Pope Damasus, in his epitaph, tells us, that his steadiness in keeping up the discipline of the church, and obliging such as had fallen, during the persecution, to give due satisfaction, stirred up against him a general hatred, which, not confined to private disputes and invectives, ended in tumults, bloodshed, and murders.<sup>4</sup> Damasus adds, that "the crime of one, who had renounced the faith, while the church enjoyed a profound peace, induced the tyrant Maxentius to send Marcellus into banishment." But of these transactions the ancients either have not thought

fit to give us a more particular account, or, if they did, their writings have not reached our times. Marcellus died on the 16th of January, 310, having held the pontificate one year, seven months, and twenty days;<sup>1</sup> but whether he died in banishment, or was recalled to Rome, is uncertain. The Church of Rome, upon the authority of his fabulous Acts, has added him, with many others, to the number of her martyrs: but Maxentius, who reigned at Rome during his pontificate, and under whom he is said to have suffered, had no sooner made himself master of that city, than he put an end to the persecution, as we are told, in express terms, by Eusebius.<sup>2</sup> He is said to have been buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Salarian way:<sup>3</sup> but his body, like the bodies of most other saints, is now worshipped in several places; viz., in a church, bearing his name, at Rome; in the Abbey of Omont in Hainault, not far from Maubeuge; at Cluni, in a parish church of the diocese of Elne in Roussillon,<sup>4</sup> &c.

## EUSEBIUS, THIRTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LICINIUS.]

[Year of Christ 310.] MARCELLUS was succeeded by Eusebius, who governed seven months, according to Eusebius,<sup>5</sup> but only four months and sixteen days, according to the pontifical of Bucherius.<sup>6</sup> From an ancient epitaph on this pope we learn, that he opposed, with great vigour and zeal, one Heraclius, pretending that those who had fallen during the persecution ought to be readmitted to the communion of the church, without giving such satisfaction as was then required; and that hereupon great divisions happening

among the people, Maxentius, to put an end to those disturbances, banished Eusebius into Sicily.<sup>5</sup> Many other things are said of him by Anastasius, Platina, Ciacconius, and such-like writers; but what we read in them has no better foundation than what is advanced by Baronius, viz., that he instructed Eusebius the celebrated Bishop of Vercelli, and gave him his own name;<sup>6</sup> which is founded on the Acts of that bishop, now universally rejected as supposititious.

## MELCHIADES, THIRTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LICINIUS.]

[Year of Christ 311.] MELCHIADES, or Miltiades, as he is called in the ancient manuscripts, was chosen to succeed Eusebius, on the 2d of July, 311, after a vacancy of nine months and upwards;<sup>7</sup> which historians do not account for. In his time happened the ever memorable conversion of Constantine to the Christian religion. That prince, having

overcome and utterly defeated the usurper Maxentius, on the 28th of October, 312, soon after issued an edict, jointly with Licinius, who was upon the point of marrying his sister, allowing the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and likewise the liberty of building churches.<sup>7</sup> By the same edict, he ordered the places where they had held their

<sup>1</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ep. 165, et in Petil. c. 16, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Bolland. 16 Jan. p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 309.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. chron.

<sup>7</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 8, c. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Boll. Jan. 16, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, et Flor. in Martyr. Hier. p. 256, 257.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 311.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ib. n. 42.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. l. 9, c. 9.



The schism of the Donatists, in Africa. Traditores, who. The chief authors of the schism against Cæcilianus. The bishops of Numidia summoned to depose him.

assemblies before the persecution, and which had been taken from them, to be restored.<sup>1</sup> He left Rome in the beginning of the year 313, and, arriving at Milan, he there issued a second edict, to correct some mistakes that had given offence in the former.<sup>2</sup> What these mistakes were, we know not; for the decree itself has not reached our times; but Valesius conjectures, that the high commendations bestowed on the Christian religion alarmed the pagans, imagining that the intention of the two princes was to suppress theirs; and likewise, that some Christians had taken offence at the odious name of heretics, given in that decree to the various sects sprung from them.<sup>3</sup> Be that as it will, it is certain, that, by the second decree, an entire liberty of conscience was granted to all sorts of persons, every one being allowed to honor and worship what deity he pleased, and in what manner soever he thought best. The second edict strictly enjoins all those who had purchased of the exchequer, or held by grant, any place formerly destined for the assemblies of the Christians, to restore them forthwith, and apply to the exchequer, where they should be indemnified.<sup>4</sup> The same year, 313, Licinius, having gained a complete victory over Maximinus, a sworn enemy to the Christians, made himself master of Nicomedia, and there caused the edict of Milan to be proclaimed and set up in the market-place, on the 13th of June.<sup>5</sup> Thus peace was restored to the church in the east as well as in the west, after a most cruel and bloody persecution of ten years and almost four months; for the first edict against the Christians had been published in that very city on the 24th of February, 303.<sup>6</sup>

Another remarkable incident of this pontificate was the famous schism, formed in Africa against Cæcilianus, the catholic bishop of Carthage; whereof a succinct account will not be foreign to my subject, as Melchiades was chiefly concerned in most of the transactions relating to it. The first decree against the Christians, published by Dioclesian, which I have just now mentioned, ordered the churches to be everywhere laid level with the ground, the books of the Scripture to be carefully sought for, and publicly burnt; and that such persons of quality as should persist in the profession of the Christian faith, should be deemed infamous, and excluded from all honors and employments. This edict was executed with such rigor in Africa, that it was a capital crime in the magistrates of the cities, and punishable with death, to show any mercy or compassion to a Christian, who, owning he had the sacred books, should refuse to deliver them into the hands of the proper officers. Those who, in compliance with this edict, delivered them up, which

great numbers did, were styled Traditores, a name which afterwards became famous in the history of the church, by affording the Donatists a plausible pretence to separate themselves from the communion of the catholic bishops.<sup>1</sup> Of this crime Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, was falsely accused; but, though the charge could not be proved against him, yet some of his flock, encouraged by Donatus, Bishop of Casænigræ, in Numidia, separated from his communion.<sup>2</sup> Mensurius dying some years after, Cæcilianus, deacon of the church of Carthage, was chosen in his room, in spite of the cabals and intrigues of Botrus and Cælesius, two chief presbyters, who aspired to that dignity. Cæcilianus, soon after his election, summoned some persons, in whose custody his predecessor had left the money of the church, to deliver it up to him: but they not only refused to comply with his demand, but began to stir up the people, and form a party against him. Botrus and Cælesius were not idle on this occasion; but, animated with jealousy and envy, left no art unpractised to blacken his character, and discredit him with those who had preferred him to them. But the chief support of this faction was Lucilla, a woman of great quality, wealth, and interest, and an avowed enemy to Cæcilianus, who, while he was yet deacon, had publicly reprimanded her for kissing the relic of a martyr, as she was upon the point of receiving the eucharist. An undeniable proof, that the worship of relics was at this time disapproved by the church. Such liberty taken with a person of her rank, was what she could not brook; and therefore she laid hold of the first opportunity that offered, and no better could offer, to revenge the affront.<sup>3</sup> It is not to be doubted but those who had separated from Mensurius joined this faction; since the second schism owed its origin to the first, as St. Austin says, speak of the two schisms under Mensurius and Cæcilianus.<sup>4</sup>

The schismatics, to give an appearance of justice and authority to their proceedings, summoned Secundus, Bishop of Tigisis, and the other bishops of Numidia, to depose Cæcilianus, and choose another in his room; for the bishops of Numidia claimed the privilege of assisting at the election of the Bishop of Carthage, and ordaining him after he was elected.<sup>5</sup> They readily complied with the summons: but upon their arrival they found, to their great surprise, that the whole city, except a small number of schismatics, the avowed enemies of Cæcilianus, communicated with him as their lawful bishop.<sup>6</sup> They were seventy in number; but as many of them

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Val. in not. ad Euseb. hist. p. 195.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Lact. pers. c. 47, 48.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. l. 7, c. 2; Opt. l. 1, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. collat. Carth. die 3, c. 12; Vales. in not. ad Euseb. hist. p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 41; Aug. Psal. Abced. p. 3, in Petil. c. 18, et contr. epist. Parmen. p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. coll. Carth. die 3, c. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. in Par. l. 1, c. 3, et Psal. Abced. p. 3; Opt. p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Opt. ib.



Cæcilianus's election declared null. From whom called Donatists. Edicts enacted by Constantine. The Donatists petition Constantine that the dispute be referred to the bishops of Gaul. He names the bishops.

were Traditors, and some guilty of other enormous crimes, as appears from the Acts of the council of Cirtha,<sup>1</sup> they were easily prevailed upon by Lucilla, who is said to have spent an immense sum on this occasion,<sup>2</sup> to declare the election of Cæcilianus void, and the see of Carthage vacant. The only thing they could lay to his charge was, that he had been ordained by Felix, Bishop of Aptungus, whom they falsely accused as a Traditor. Cæcilianus refused to appear before them; and, truly, to trust himself to such an assembly had been acting a very imprudent part; for Purpurius, Bishop of Limata, had said, "If he comes among us, instead of laying our hands upon him by way of ordination, we ought to knock out his brains by way of penance."<sup>3</sup>

The party having thus declared Cæcilianus illegally elected and ordained, they separated themselves from his communion, and from the communion of all who communicated with him;<sup>4</sup> that is, from the communion of the catholic church; for Cæcilianus was acknowledged by the other bishops of Africa, by the Bishop of Rome, and by all the bishops of the world, says St. Austin.<sup>5</sup> Such was the rise of the famous schism, which, for the space of three hundred years and upwards, occasioned great disturbances in the churches of Africa. Donatus, Bishop of Casænigræ, in Numidia, was the first author of it, according to St. Austin;<sup>6</sup> but it was not from him, but from Donatus, the schismatic Bishop of Carthage, that they took the name of Donatists; for, till his time, they styled themselves the party of Majorinus,<sup>7</sup> whom they chose and ordained Bishop of Carthage, in the room of Cæcilianus; though he was then only lector of that church, and had been formerly one of Lucilla's menial servants.<sup>8</sup> To justify their conduct, and their electing a new bishop, they wrote letters to all the churches of Africa, filled with calumnies against Cæcilianus, and those who had ordained him. By these letters great numbers were imposed upon, and misled; insomuch that the people being everywhere divided, most churches had two bishops, the one ordained by Majorinus and the other by Cæcilianus.<sup>9</sup>

About this time, that is, about the year 313, Constantine, out of his zeal for the Christian religion, issued two decrees, addressed to Anulinus, Proconsul of Africa, the one commanding all the places in that province to be restored, which had once belonged to the catholic church, and might have been usurped during the persecution;<sup>10</sup> and the other, exempting the ecclesiastics from all

civil functions.<sup>1</sup> This privilege was granted only to the ecclesiastics of the catholic church, whereof Cæcilianus was the head, as was expressly declared in the edict; and therefore to him alone the proconsul imparted it. It was a great mortification to the Donatists to see themselves thus disregarded by the emperor: they therefore assembled a few days after, and, drawing up a petition to Constantine, they delivered it, unsealed, to Anulinus, together with a bundle of papers, sealed up in a leather bag, with this title: "The Petition of the catholic church, containing the crimes of Cæcilianus; by the party of Majorinus." The substance of the petition was, that the controversy between them and the other bishops of Africa might be referred to the bishops of Gaul, who were free from the imputation of having delivered up the sacred books to the pagans.<sup>2</sup> Anulinus immediately despatched a messenger to the emperor, both with the request and the papers, giving him, at the same time, by a letter still extant,<sup>3</sup> an insight into the dispute, that made so great a noise in Africa. Constantine, who was then in Gaul, having received and read all those pieces, expressed great concern to find the Christians thus divided among themselves, and the bishops at variance with one another.<sup>4</sup> However, he readily granted to the Donatists the judges they demanded, naming, for that purpose, Maternus bishop of Cologne, Rheticius bishop of Autun, and Marinus bishop of Arles;<sup>5</sup> all men of known integrity, great learning, and unblemished characters. To these, by a letter under his own hand, he gave notice of their new commission; and, at the same time, for their better information, he caused copies to be transmitted to them of all the papers he had received from Anulinus.<sup>6</sup> The three bishops were ordered to repair, with all speed, to Rome, and there jointly with Melchiades, bishop of that city, to sit as judges of the controversy. Cæcilianus likewise was ordered to Rome, and allowed to take with him ten bishops of his party, such as he should judge the most capable of defending his cause; and the same liberty was granted to the adverse party.<sup>7</sup> Constantine, in the letter he wrote on this occasion to Melchiades, after appealing to him as a witness of the respect and veneration he had for the catholic church, declares, he had nothing so much at heart as to see her members happily united: he therefore earnestly entreats him to examine the affair with the utmost attention, and, jointly with the bishops of Gaul, to judge it according to the strictest laws of justice and equity.<sup>8</sup> In this letter Constantine names no other judges but the three bishops of Gaul, Mel-

<sup>1</sup> Aug. in Cresc. l. 3, c. 26, 27, 29, et coll. die 3, c. 17, die 2, c. 14, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. in Gaud. l. 1, c. 37, ep. 162, et in Psal. 36, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Opt. p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. coll. die 3, c. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ep. 162.

<sup>6</sup> In Joan. evang. tract. 69, p. 12.

<sup>7</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 93.

<sup>8</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 42.

<sup>9</sup> Aug. ep. 162.

<sup>10</sup> Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 10, c. 7, et Cod. Theod. 16, t. 2, l. 1, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ep. 68; Vales. in not. ad hist. Euseb. p. 197.

<sup>3</sup> Coll. Carth. in concil. per Steph. Baluz. c. 3, n. 216, 220, p. 578.

<sup>4</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 44.

<sup>5</sup> Opt. ib. Aug. ep. 166.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Coll. Carth. p. 149.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. ib.



The council of Rome. Cæcilianus absolved, and Donatus condemned. Melchiades dies. Whether the Lateran palace was given by Constantine to Melchiades.

chiades, and one Mark, supposed to have been Bishop of Milan, whom he joins with Melchiades; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that they were at last nineteen in all.<sup>1</sup> They met, for the first time, on Friday the 2d of October, 313, Constantine and Licinius being the third time consuls.<sup>2</sup> The place they met in was the apartment of Fausta, in the Lateran palace,<sup>3</sup> she being then, in all likelihood, absent in Gaul with the emperor, her husband. Before this assembly Cæcilianus appeared as the person accused, and Donatus, of Casænigræ, as the accuser. They had but three meetings: in the first the characters of the accusers and witnesses were strictly inquired into, and their depositions heard; in the second, the acts of the council of Carthage, which had condemned Cæcilianus, as I have related above, were examined; and in the last, Cæcilianus, against whom nothing had been proved, was absolved, and Donatus condemned as a slanderer, and the chief author of the schism.<sup>4</sup> An account of the whole, together with the acts of the council, was immediately transmitted to Constantine, who began to flatter himself, that he had put an end to the dispute; for he could not imagine that the Donatists would appeal from the judgment of such unexceptionable judges, of judges whom they themselves had demanded. But the good prince was yet a stranger to the nature of religious disputes, to the heat, animosity, and enthusiastic rancor with which they are commonly carried on. Notwithstanding the pains he took, and his successors after him, and no pains they spared, to heal these unhappy divisions, they continued, to the great scandal of the pagans, rending the church into most furious parties and factions, for the space of near three hundred years. The council of Rome was held in the month of October, 313, and Melchiades died on the 10th of January ensuing, Volusianus and Anienus being consuls, having presided for the space of two years, six months, and eight days.<sup>5</sup> About an hundred years after, the Donatists charged him with having delivered up the sacred books, and offered incense to the pagan gods; but this St. Austin calls a groundless charge, a mere calumny, a malicious invention of the Donatists of his time to justify the conduct of their predecessors, in appealing, as they did, from the council of Rome, at which Melchiades assisted, and probably presided, as bishop of the imperial city.<sup>6</sup>

Baronius, impatient to see the pope raised to the rank of a prince, endeavours to prove, that Melchiades was placed in that station

by Constantine, and argues thus: the council of Rome was held in the Lateran palace; therefore that palace had been given by Constantine to Melchiades, and belonged to him; for that an assembly of nineteen bishops only should meet in so spacious a place, can not otherwise be accounted for, but by supposing the pope to have resided there. This he calls a demonstration.<sup>1</sup> Having thus got him a palace, and, no doubt, magnificently furnished, he finds no difficulty in equipping him in every other respect as a prince: for who can imagine, says he, that Constantine, so pious, so generous a prince, would have given to the head of the church a royal palace to live in, and not allow him at the same time a suitable retinue, with suitable appointments? To act otherwise, had not been honoring, but disgracing the Christian religion, since its high pontiff, stalking about all alone in a huge palace, could be but an object of ridicule to the pontiffs of the pagan superstition, who lived in magnificent houses, with answerable grandeur.<sup>2</sup> Thus is the bishop metamorphosed at once into a sovereign. But the metamorphosis is somewhat premature. If Constantine, yet a neophyte, was not well acquainted with the true spirit of the Christian religion, Melchiades was; and therefore, had that prince offered to distinguish him by any such marks of worldly grandeur, I do not question but, as he was a very good man, he would have taken from thence an opportunity of instructing him better in the principles of his new profession, and showing him in what contempt the Christian prelates had, and he himself ought to have, all worldly grandeur. But no such offer was ever made or dreamt of: for what at length is all this founded on? On the meeting of the council in the Lateran palace. The French academy meet in the Louvre: are they therefore princes? And does not Optatus, of whom we have the whole account, call it in express terms the house of Fausta?<sup>3</sup> Fausta perhaps lived there, says Baronius, during the long and flourishing reign of her father Maximian, and thence it might be called the house of Fausta. Thus in the end is his demonstration dwindled away to a mere conjecture, and a very groundless one too: but, waiving that, why might not Fausta continue in the same palace after her father's death, with her husband Constantine, when he was at Rome, or alone, when she did not attend him in the wars? The annalist seems to have forgot that Fausta was Constantine's wife. But after all, the empress, as it appears to me, had only an apartment in the Lateran; for in this sense I understand Optatus saying, "The council was held in the house, or habitation, of Fausta in the Lateran." But her being any-ways there excludes Melchiades. Their sitting in the imperial palace gave a kind of

<sup>1</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. coll. Carth. die 3, c. 17; Opt. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup> Coll. Carth. p. 149 et ep. 162. Opt. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>6</sup> Aug. in Pet. p. 87, et in Par. c. 5, p. 8.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 312, n. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. n. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Opt. l. 1, p. 44.



The Donatists complain of the council of Rome. The council of Arles. Cæcilianus declared innocent.

authority and sanction to their decisions; and besides, there might not be room in the house of Melchiades, if he had a house, for the council, and those who were to attend it, they

being in all forty bishops; so that we need not put Melchiades in possession of that palace to account for the council's meeting in it, as Baronius has done.

## SYLVESTER, THIRTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 314.] SYLVESTER was chosen in the room of Melchiades on the last of January, 314.<sup>1</sup> In his time were held the two great councils of Arles and Nice. The former was convened by Constantine's order at the request of the Donatists, who, instead of acquiescing to the judgment of the council of Rome, loudly complained to the emperor of the bishops who composed it, as partial, prejudiced, and over-hasty in deciding a controversy of the greatest importance.<sup>2</sup> Constantine heard them with great patience; and that he might leave them no color or pretence whatsoever to continue in their schism, he summoned a second council to meet at Arles, inviting several bishops to it with most pathetic letters under his own hand, and ordering the proconsuls and governors of provinces to acquaint the rest with his desire and intention. Chrestus, or Crescentius, Bishop of Syracuse, was allowed, and so, without all doubt, were the rest, to bring two presbyters with him, and three attendants, as we learn from the emperor's letter to him, which is still extant.<sup>3</sup> They were all to be supplied with conveniences for travelling, and every thing else, at the public expense. The time appointed for their meeting was the first of August, 314, and on that day they met accordingly,<sup>4</sup> not from all parts of the world, as we read in the Acts of the second council of Arles,<sup>5</sup> but from Africa, and most other provinces of the west. Sylvester bishop of Rome was invited to it; but he excused himself on account of his age, and sent in his room the two presbyters, Claudianus and Vitus, with Eugenius and Cyriacus, deacons: the Bishop of Ostia sent likewise two presbyters in his room.<sup>6</sup> By this assembly Cæcilianus was again declared innocent, and those who should falsely accuse their brethren cut off from the communion of the church, without hopes of being ever re-admitted, except at the point of death.<sup>7</sup> As to the schismatic bishops, it was agreed, that such of them as abandoned the schism should not forfeit their dignity, but sit alternately with the catholic bishop till one of them died.<sup>8</sup> The council, before they broke up, acquainted

the Bishop of Rome with their proceedings, and at the same time sent him the decrees they had made concerning the discipline of the church, not to be confirmed by him, as Baronius would make us believe,<sup>1</sup> but that, *by his means, as he held larger dioceses, they might be the sooner known.* These are the very words of the council.<sup>2, 3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 314, n. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. p. 1425.

<sup>3</sup> Several canons were made by this council relating to the discipline of the church. 1. It was ordained, that Easter should be kept on the same day, and on a Sunday, by all the churches in the world; and that the Bishop of Rome should acquaint the other churches with the day. But it was afterwards ordained, that the Bishop of Alexandria should fix the day, and give timely notice of it to the Bishop of Rome, that by his means it might be notified to the whole church. This ordinance St. Cyril seems to ascribe to the council of Nice; for he says, that it was "so enacted by a synod composed of all the saints of the earth;" which, at the time he wrote, that is, about the year 360, could be said of no other synod but that of Nice. Pope Leo the Great, speaking of this custom in a letter to the Emperor Marcian, only says, that it was "established by the holy fathers." (Leo, ep. 94, c. 1.) He meant, perhaps, the fathers of Nice. But as they took no notice of such a custom in their letter to the church of Egypt, I cannot suppose it to have been introduced by them. The care of fixing the day, and acquainting the Bishop of Rome with it, was probably committed to the Bishop of Alexandria, because the Egyptians were thought to be better acquainted with the motions of the heavenly bodies than any other nation. In other provinces the bishops seem to have been utter strangers to astronomy, and to that ignorance was chiefly owing their disagreement with respect to the celebration of Easter. This custom still obtained in the fifth century, as appears from a letter of Leo the Great, dated the 28th of July, 454. For by that letter he acquaints the bishops of Gaul and Spain, that the following year, 455, Easter would fall on the 24th of April, "as it had been settled in the east." (Leo, ep. 109.) Before his time, Innocent I., being at a loss to know on what day Easter should be kept in 414, had recourse to Aurelius bishop of Carthage, entreating him to examine that point in a council, and let him know what they determined, that he might notify it, as was customary, to other churches. Innocent had quarrelled, on Chrysostom's account, with the eastern bishops; and therefore chose rather to be informed and directed by the African bishops than by them. 2. It was decreed, that such as had been baptized by heretics in the name of the Trinity, should not be rebaptized, but admitted into the church only by the imposition of hands. But to this decree of the council no greater regard was paid, than had been paid in St. Cyprian's time to the decisions of Pope Stephen. For in the year 370, the same practice of rebaptizing heretics still obtained in several churches of Africa, as appears from Optatus, who wrote about that time. In the east some held, and some denied the validity of baptism administered by a heretic. Of the latter opinion was the great Athanasius, who flourished from the year 326 to 373; and St. Basil, who wrote about the year 369, after examining, in his letter to Amphilochus, the two opposite practices, seems inclined to think the baptism of heretics null. According to the present doctrine of the Church of Rome, baptism, by whomsoever administered, whether Jew, gentile, heretic, Mahomedan, &c., whether man or woman, or even a child, is valid, provided it be only administered with an intention of administering it, without which

<sup>1</sup> Buch. p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. l. 10, c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. ib. et concil. t. 1, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. et concil. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Conc. Gen. t. 1, p. 106.

<sup>6</sup> Concil. p. 1425.

<sup>7</sup> Concil. ib.

<sup>8</sup> Concil. ib.



Osius did not assist at the council of Nice as the pope's legate. Nor did he preside. Eusebius of Cæsarea did not harangue the emperor at the opening of the council, but on another occasion.

The other grand council that was held during the pontificate of Sylvester was that of Nice, so famous in the history of the church; but the bishop of the reigning city, says Eusebius,<sup>1</sup> being prevented by his great age from undertaking so long a journey, he sent Vitus and Vincentius, two Roman presbyters, to supply his room,<sup>2</sup> with orders to agree in his name to the decisions of the council.<sup>3</sup> In process of time such orders grew out of date, and the modest name of Roman presbyters, given to those who were sent by the bishops of Rome, either to councils or princes, was changed into the lofty title of *Legates a latere*. Baronius,<sup>4</sup> and after him most writers of the Church of Rome, maintain Osius, the celebrated Bishop of Cordoua, to have assisted, nay, and presided at the council of Nice as the pope's legate. Vitus and Vincentius, say they, represented the person of the pope; but Osius held his place, and the place of all the bishops of the west. That Osius assisted at the council with the character of the pope's legate, is affirmed, I own, by Gelasius of Cyzicus, who flourished about the end of the fifth century:<sup>5</sup> but Eusebius, who was present, mentions only Vitus and Vincentius as sent thither by Sylvester. In like manner all the historians, who have written of that council after Eusebius till the time of Gelasius, in naming those two presbyters and Osius, which they all do, constantly distinguish the former by the title of the Deputies, the Representatives, &c. of the

every sacrament, say they, is null. This doctrine, with respect to the intention, proves daily to timorous consciences the source of endless doubts and perplexities, which can never be removed: for though they may know, for certain, that the ceremony was performed, yet they can never know whether or not it was performed with the due intention. In confessions, for instance, they may hear the words of the absolution pronounced by the priest; but they know nothing of his intention, of the intention of the minister who baptized him, of the bishop who ordained him, of the priest who baptized, or the bishops who ordained that bishop, and so up to the apostles, by whom the first bishops were ordained. Should the right intention have been wanting in any of these—should the priest, while he pronounces the words of absolution, have his thoughts employed on some other object, as it may easily happen; the penitent sinner would depart from his tribunal with the whole load of his sins, and be damned, notwithstanding his repentance, for, or, more properly speaking, through want of attention in the priest. A most unchristian and impious doctrine, placing our eternal salvation in the hands of others, and not in our own. 3. The council decreed, that excommunicated persons should be nowhere absolved from the excommunication but in the places where they had been excommunicated. The bishops of Rome did not yet know, it seems, that they were vested with an unlimited power of binding and loosening, of excommunicating and absolving, with respect to all persons and places; for had Sylvester but dreamt of such a power, we may well suppose he would never have suffered it to be thus controlled. Several other canons were made by this council, in all twenty-two; but it is foreign to my purpose to take notice of them. I shall only observe, that the council consisted of thirty-three bishops, and not of two hundred, as Baronius supposes, upon the authority of St. Austin, whom he misunderstood; and that Marinus bishop of Arles presided, his name being placed at the head of the subscriptions, and the names of Sylvester's legates after his.

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. l. 3, c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. p. 430.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret. l. 1, c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 325, n. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Gal. Cyz. de Nic. concil. l. 2, c. 5, p. 68.

Bishop of Rome, and never the latter. Besides, Vitus and Vincentius, in subscribing to the canons of the council, declare, that they do it *in the name of the venerable pope*, or father, *Sylvester their bishop*;<sup>1</sup> whereas Osius subscribes, like the other bishops, in his own name. As to his presiding at that great assembly, his name, 'tis true, is marked the first by Socrates,<sup>2</sup> among those who subscribed to the definitions and canons of the council; but yet I am inclined to believe that honour not to have been conferred upon him, but upon Eustathius bishop of Antioch; for John, bishop of the same city, writing to Proculus about the year 435, styles him the first of the fathers assembled at Nice,<sup>3</sup> and Facundus calls him the first of the council.<sup>4</sup> In the Chronicle of Nicephorus he is styled the head of the fathers of Nice:<sup>5</sup> and from Theodoret we learn, that he sat the first on the right hand in the assembly, and harangued the emperor,<sup>6</sup> which it was the president's province to do.<sup>7</sup>

The honor of presiding belonged of right to Alexander bishop of Alexandria; but he, it seems, declined it, perhaps to obviate the complaints of the Arians, who looked upon him as a party concerned, and one highly prejudiced against them. I know that the haranguing of Constantine is ascribed to Eusebius the historian, in the title of the chapter in which he mentions it,<sup>8</sup> that Sozomen positively affirms it, and that the learned Valesius thinks there is no room to doubt of it, since Eusebius was the most eloquent bishop of those times; and besides, he himself tells us, that he pronounced a speech in praise of Constantine, on occasion of his entering into the twentieth year of his reign, while he was sitting in the midst of the ministers of God;<sup>9</sup> meaning thereby, no doubt, the bishops assembled at Nice. That Eusebius harangued the emperor before that venerable assembly, is not at all to be questioned; but that the bishops, who composed it, should have pitched upon one who was suspected, or rather convicted, of Arianism, to address the emperor in their name, at the opening of the council, seems to me highly improbable. The orator, whoever he was, sat in the first place, or at least in the second, (that I may not quarrel with Baronius, who will have the place on the left hand to have been the most honourable:<sup>10</sup>) and what right had the Bishop of Cæsarea to that honor? I may add, that a short compliment, such as is that which the presbyter

<sup>1</sup> Con. t. 2, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 1, c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Facund. l. 8, c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, l. 2, c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Niceph. cron.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 6.

<sup>7</sup> The title of President is given him in a letter, which is commonly ascribed to Pope Felix III. (Concil. t. 1, p. 1072.) But I am well apprised, that no great stress should be laid on that piece, since some surmise it to have been composed in the eighth century.

<sup>8</sup> Euseb. in vit. Const. l. 3, c. 11.

<sup>9</sup> Euseb. l. 1, c. 1; Vales. in not. p. 223.

<sup>10</sup> Bar. ad ann. 325, n. 56—59.



The council of Nice not convened by the pope. The council commands all causes to be finally determined by provincial synods. The hierarchy first formed. The office and duty of Bishops. How ordained.

Gregory ascribes to Eustathius of Antioch,<sup>1</sup> had been far more proper on that occasion than Eusebius's long and tedious panegyric, which therefore some suppose to have been pronounced on occasion of the magnificent entertainment which Constantine gave the bishops, as they were preparing to return to their respective sees; for he then entered into the twentieth year of his reign, which began on the 25th of July, 325, and it was on that occasion that Eusebius wrote, and delivered his panegyric before the emperor, and the fathers of the council, as he himself declares.<sup>2</sup> To conclude, had Eusebius been appointed by that great assembly to address the emperor in their name, his modesty had not prevented him from describing the spokesman so as to leave no room to doubt on whom that honor had been conferred.

Before I dismiss this subject, it may not be improper, nor foreign to my purpose, to observe, that the council of Nice, the first general or œcumenical council held in the church, was convened by the emperor, and not by the Bishop of Rome; that the Bishop of Rome did not preside in it either in person, or by his legates, as they are pleased to style them; and consequently that the privilege which they assumed in after ages of assembling general councils, and presiding in them, ought to be deemed a most insolent and unwarrantable usurpation. The second thing worthy of notice with respect to this council is its fifth canon, commanding all ecclesiastical causes to be finally decided in each province by a provincial synod. The words of the canon are clear in themselves, and besides have been understood in this sense by all the councils that were held, by all the authors that wrote, for several ages after;<sup>3</sup> nay, it was understood in this sense by some of the popes themselves, namely, by Innocent I., who, in one of his letters to Victricius bishop of Roan, writes thus: "If any controversy should arise among the clerks, whether they be of an inferior or superior rank, let it be decided, agreeably to the council of Nice, in an assembly of the bishops of the same province."<sup>4</sup> 'Tis true, he adds, "without prejudicing the rights of the Roman see." But that restriction is his own, and not the council's. Hence this canon, directing all causes to be thus tried, all disputes to be thus ended, was often quoted on occasion of appeals made to Rome, and employed as a bulwark to restrain the encroaching power of the popes within due bounds; but in process of time their ambition, supported by the favor of princes, and the great temporalities they acquired, bore all down before them.

It was in the pontificate of Sylvester, and under the benign auspices of Constantine,

that the ecclesiastical hierarchy was first formed and settled in the manner it continues to this day; the new form of government introduced by that prince into the state serving as a model for the government of the church. In the three first centuries no other hierarchy was known, no other degrees thought of, but those of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Of these alone was composed the whole body of the clergy; but with this difference, that the bishop or supervisor was the general disposer and manager of all things within the bounds of his jurisdiction, nothing being done there without his consent and approbation, and the presbyters and deacons his assistants, or his counsellors and senate, as St. Jerom,<sup>1</sup> and before him St. Ignatius,<sup>2</sup> styled them. This order was probably introduced, according to Grotius,<sup>3</sup> in imitation of the Jewish synagogues; for each synagogue had its ruler, who presided over the rest, its pastors and its eleemosynaries; to the ruler succeeded the bishop, to the pastors the presbyters, and to the eleemosynaries the deacons. It was the bishop's office and duty to preach the word,<sup>4</sup> to pray with his people,<sup>5</sup> to administer the sacraments,<sup>6</sup> to ordain ministers,<sup>7</sup> to excommunicate offenders,<sup>8</sup> to absolve penitents,<sup>9</sup> and to regulate and settle every thing relating to his particular church,<sup>10</sup> with the consent and concurrence of the presbytery; for the presbyters were his counsellors or senate, and, together with him, presided in the consistories of those times, as we learn from Tertullian telling us, that in those courts "approved elders presided."<sup>11</sup> Hence Petrus de Marca concludes the original government of the church to have been mixt of monarchy and aristocracy; or, to use his own words, the monarchical government of the church to have been tempered with the aristocratical. As the bishop could not discharge, as he ought, the above-mentioned functions, without residing among those who were committed to his care, his residence was deemed absolutely necessary, and non-residence a most heinous transgression; insomuch that St. Cyprian, enumerating the sins that brought the wrath of God upon the church in the bloody persecution of Decius, mentions non-residence in the bishops as one.<sup>12</sup> Upon the vacancy of a see a new bishop was chosen in the room of the deceased, in some places by the clergy and people of that church alone, in others by the neighboring bishops, the people and the clergy only expressing their desire, and giving testimony of the life and manners of the person proposed, and in some by the joint suffrages of the clergy, of the people, and of the neighboring bishops. These three different methods of electing we find practised

<sup>1</sup> Surius, 10 Jul. p. 159.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. vit. Const. l. 3, c. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Elli. Du Pin de antiq. eccles. discip. p. 98. et seq.

<sup>4</sup> Inn. in epist. ad Vict. c. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. in c. 2, Isai.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Basil. ep. 319.

<sup>3</sup> Grot. de imp. summ. potest. c. 11, n. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Orig. in Ezek. hom. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Justin. apol. 2, p. 98.

<sup>6</sup> Tert. de bapt. p. 602.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ib. p. 99.

<sup>8</sup> Cypr. ep. 38, p. 90.

<sup>9</sup> Idem. ep. 10, p. 30.

<sup>10</sup> Tert. ib. p. 39.

<sup>11</sup> Idem ib. p. 709.

<sup>12</sup> Cypr. de laps. n. 4, p. 278.



The office and duty of Presbyters. Qualifications requisite in a Presbyter. The institution and office of Deacons. Their number.

at different times with respect to the same church; but on no occasion was the choice of the neighboring bishops sufficient without the consent of the clergy and people, nor the election of the clergy and people without the approbation of the neighboring bishops. The bishop being thus elected and confirmed, he was in the next place ordained; and this ceremony was performed by the neighboring bishops, in his own church, and in the presence of his flock, by the imposition of hands. The new bishop, agreeably to a custom which obtained then, immediately gave notice of his promotion to other bishops, especially to those of the greater sees, who, by receiving and answering his letters, were said to communicate with him, and to acknowledge him lawfully chosen.

In the second degree were the presbyters or priests, whose office or province it was to assist the bishop in the discharge of his pastoral commission, whence they are often styled the bishop's assistants: with his consent and approbation they preached the word, they prayed with the people, they administered the sacraments, they absolved penitents, and, in short, discharged every office which the bishop did, except those of ordaining, confirming, and excommunicating; I say, with the bishop's consent and approbation, for no spiritual function could they perform without his leave, as is manifest from Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> Origen,<sup>2</sup> St. Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> and above all from St. Ignatius, in his famous letter to the church of Smyrna.<sup>4</sup> The church, in those happy days, admitted none to the sacred functions, but such as were known by a long trial to be well qualified for so great a charge. The qualifications requisite in a presbyter, so far as I can learn from the ancients, may be reduced to these four heads: his condition in the world, his conversation, his learning, and his age. He was not to be entangled with any worldly affairs, with any secular employments, but at perfect liberty to apply himself wholly to the functions of his office.<sup>5</sup> He was to be of an unspotted and exemplary life;<sup>6</sup> and therefore, before ordination, he was proposed to the presbytery and people for their testimony and approbation. He was to be well versed in the Scripture, and capable of teaching others, and instructing them in the mysteries of the Christian religion. As for human learning, it was not required in a presbyter; nay, by some it was condemned, particularly logic and philosophy, as in a manner inconsistent with Christianity,<sup>7</sup> but at the same time highly commended and applauded by others as conducive to the right understanding of the Scripture, and necessary for confuting the

sophisms of heretics;<sup>1</sup> whence logic especially is recommended by Clemens Alexandrinus to all ecclesiastics, as "a hedge to defend the truth from being trod down by sophists."<sup>2</sup> As for the age of a presbyter, he was to be stricken in years, as the very name of a presbyter or elder sufficiently declares. However, if a young man was endowed with extraordinary gifts and talents, his age was dispensed with in respect both to the sacerdotal and episcopal dignity. Thus was Aurelius, though young in years, raised, in regard of his great merit, to the rank of a presbyter, as we read in St. Cyprian;<sup>3</sup> and the Bishop of Magnesia, in St. Ignatius's time, was, it seems, but a young man, since Ignatius, in his letter to the Magnesians, exhorts them "not to despise their bishop's age, but to yield him all due respect and reverence."<sup>4</sup> These were the qualifications requisite in a candidate for the ministry: if he was recommended by them, (for no other commendation could avail him,) he was admitted to holy orders; if not, he was rejected as unfit for the sacred function. The person ordained was at liberty to serve the church where he had received his orders, or any other where his assistance might be wanted; for he was not ordained minister of any particular church, but of the church universal.

In the third and last degree were the deacons, whose original institution was to "serve tables," as we read in the Acts;<sup>5</sup> that is, to inspect the poor, and relieve them by a proper distribution of the offerings made by the faithful, which were committed to their charge, though they could not dispose of them without the bishop's knowledge.<sup>6</sup> They were ordained by the imposition of hands,<sup>7</sup> and therefore deemed ministers of the altar, as well as dispensers of alms; and with a great deal of reason, for they assisted the bishops or presbyters in administering the eucharist, by delivering the elements to the communicants;<sup>8</sup> they carried the eucharist to such as had not been able to assist with the rest at divine service;<sup>9</sup> they preached, and, in the absence of the bishop and presbyters, conferred the sacrament of baptism.<sup>10</sup> The presbyters of a church were not confined to a set number; but the deacons were, no church having more than seven in the primitive times, that being the original number instituted by the apostles. Thus the church of Rome had but seven in the times of Pope Cornelius<sup>11</sup> and Pope Sixtus II.,<sup>12</sup> the church of Saragosa the same number in the time of Vincentius, who flourished under Dioclesian.<sup>13</sup> The fourteenth canon of the council of Neo-

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. de bapt. p. 602.

<sup>2</sup> Orig. hom. de Engast. vol. i. p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 10, p. 29, ep. 11, p. 32, ep. 12, p. 37.

<sup>4</sup> Ign. ad. Smyrn. p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. ep. 66, p. 195; Tert. de præscript. p. 89.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ep. 68, p. 201.

<sup>7</sup> Tert. advers. Hermog. p. 266, et de præscript. p. 70, 71.

<sup>1</sup> Orig. contra Cels. l. 6, p. 279; Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 1, p. 207, l. 6, p. 472, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 6, p. 472.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 33, p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> Ign. ep. ad Magnes. p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Acts vi. 1, 2, 3, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Const. Apost. l. 2, p. 31, 32.

<sup>7</sup> Acts vi. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Just. apol. 2, p. 97.

<sup>9</sup> Idem ib. p. 98.

<sup>10</sup> Tert. de bapt. p. 602.

<sup>11</sup> Euseb. l. 6, c. 43.

<sup>12</sup> Prud. de coron. mar. p. 71.

<sup>13</sup> Idem ib. p. 91.



Subdeacons, Acolytes, Readers, &c. Each church independent. The ecclesiastical polity adapted to the civil. The new form of government introduced by Constantine. The civil and ecclesiastical polity compared.

cæsarea, or the fifteenth, according to the Greek, forbids this number to be enlarged, even in the greatest and most populous cities;<sup>1</sup> whence St. Jerom writes, that great respect was paid to the deacons, because they were few in number.<sup>2</sup>

As for the subdeacons, acolytes, lectors, janitors, and exorcists, they were not considered as anyways belonging to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, being employed only in the meaner offices of the church, by the due discharge of which they were to give proof of their integrity and attention, in order to be raised to a higher degree; for in those days very few, and none but upon some very extraordinary occasion, arrived at once, or, as they call it, *per saltum*, at the episcopal dignity.

During the three first centuries each church was in a manner independent, that is, could make such regulations relating to its discipline and government as were judged proper and expedient, without the concurrence and authority of other churches.<sup>3</sup> However, in all matters of moment, the bishops used to advise with one another, especially with those of the same province, who frequently met to settle all ecclesiastical affairs within their respective limits. Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, writes, that in his province they met every year;<sup>4</sup> and from the frequent synods mentioned by St. Cyprian, we may conclude them to have been held in that province at least once a year. These synods or assemblies were composed of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laymen, representing the people of their several churches.<sup>5</sup> They met by their own appointment and authority, there being no Christian magistrates in those days to convene synods. Being thus assembled, they chose in the first place one, and sometimes two bishops, to preside.<sup>6</sup> It was their office and duty to see the point in question calmly and fairly debated, to sum up in each debate what had been urged on both sides, to take the votes and suffrages of the members of the synod, and last of all to give their own.<sup>7</sup> In these assemblies all ecclesiastical affairs were settled by the majority of votes, and their decrees and decisions were binding with respect to those churches whose representatives were present;<sup>8</sup> but were not so with respect to other churches.

Such was the hierarchy, such the government of the church, during the three first centuries. But in the fourth and following ages great alterations were made in both, the church adapting her government to that of the state, namely, to the new form of government introduced by Constantine, who had settled her in peace, and taken the priesthood into his immediate protection. For it was in

his reign that the titles of Patriarchs, Exarchs, Metropolitans, were first heard of, or at least had any power, authority, or privileges, annexed to them. That this conformity between the civil and ecclesiastical polity may appear more plainly, I shall premise a succinct account of the former, as established by Constantine throughout the empire. That prince divided the whole Roman world into four prefectures, namely, the east, Illyricum, Gaul, and Italy, which were governed by four prefects, called *Præfecti Prætorio*. Till his time the whole empire was governed under the emperors by two prefects only, as Zosimus informs us;<sup>1</sup> and this division is supposed to have been made by Constantine, jealous of the too great power of those magistrates. Each prefecture was subdivided into several dioceses, and each diocese into several provinces. Thus the prefecture of the east contained five dioceses; namely, the east divided into ten provinces, Egypt into six, Pontus into eleven, Asia into ten, and Thrace into six. Under the prefecture of Illyricum were two dioceses; Macedon, consisting of eight provinces; and Dacia, consisting of four. The prefecture of Gaul comprised three dioceses, Gaul made up of seventeen provinces, Spain of seven, and Britain of five. The prefecture of Italy was divided into two vicarages or lieutenantcies; the one of Rome, comprehending ten provinces, under the vicar of Rome, whence they were called suburbicarian provinces; the other of Italy, containing seven provinces, governed by the vicar of Italy, who resided at Milan, whence they were simply called provinces of Italy. Under the prefect of Italy was likewise West Africa, and after Constantine's death West Illyricum. The prefects had other officers under them, by whom the provinces were more immediately governed. These were, to name them according to their rank and dignity, proconsuls, vicars, consulars, correctors, and presidents. Each diocese had its metropolis, and likewise each province contained in the diocese.

Now, if we compare the civil polity thus described, with the ecclesiastical, we shall find them in most places answering each other, in every respect, and one bishop raised above the rest, according to the rank that was given by this new division to the city in which he presided. Thus, for instance, the chief cities of the five dioceses of the oriental prefecture were—Antioch, the metropolis of the oriental diocese; Alexandria, of the Egyptian; Ephesus, of the Asiatic; Cæsarea, of the Pontic; and Heraclea, of the Thracian. Now the bishops of these cities, in regard of the eminence of their sees, were exalted above all other bishops, and distinguished with the title of exarchs; nay, and by degrees they acquired, not to say usurped, a kind of authority and jurisdiction over the bishops of the inferior sees, which was afterwards confirmed

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 1, p. 1448.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. ep. 55, 72, 52.

<sup>4</sup> Apud Cypr. ep. 75.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. ep. 14, 26, 31; Euseb. l. 5, c. 16, et l. 7, c. 30; Act. concil. Carth. apud Cypr. p. 443.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. l. 5, c. 23, et 24.

<sup>7</sup> Act. concil. Carth. p. 443.

<sup>8</sup> Cypr. ep. 59.

<sup>1</sup> Zos. l. 2, p. 623.



The prefectures of Illyricum, Gaul, Spain, and Italy. The ecclesiastical polity of Italy agreeable to the civil. The ecclesiastical polity in Africa. Exarchs, Metropolitans, &c., not of divine institution.

to them by several councils. In like manner, the bishop of the metropolis of each province was, on account of the dignity of his see, honored with the title of metropolitan, to which were annexed several privileges, of which I shall speak hereafter. When one province was divided into two, which often happened, the ecclesiastical polity was likewise altered, and the bishop of the new metropolis raised to the dignity of a metropolitan. Several instances might be alleged of ambitious bishops applying to the emperors for a division of the province, that their city might acquire the title of metropolis, and they, of course, that of metropolitans. When the city of Byzantium was declared the metropolis of another empire, the Exarchate of Heraclea, the metropolis of the Thracian diocese, was, by that change, transferred from Heraclea to the new metropolis; so that the Bishop of Heraclea became suffragan to the Bishop of Byzantium, or, as it was then called, Constantinople, who, till that time, had been suffragan to him. Upon the division of a province, the churches were likewise divided, and the bishop of the new metropolis acquired all the privileges and power of a metropolitan over the churches taken by the change in the civil government from the ancient metropolis. But it was afterwards decreed, by the council of Chalcedon, that if any city should be raised to the dignity of a metropolis, the bishop of that city should enjoy the title, but not the privileges of a metropolitan. Thus the bishops of Nice and Berytus were honored with the title of metropolitans, and took place of all the other bishops of those provinces; but nevertheless continued to be suffragans to their ancient metropolitans, the bishops of Nicomedia and Tyre. For the same reason several bishops in the kingdom of Naples enjoy, to this day, the title of metropolitans; but neither have, nor ever had, any province or suffragans. The above-mentioned decree was enacted by the council of Chalcedon, to prevent the bishops from recurring, as they often did, to the emperors, and to obviate the frequent changes that were thereby introduced into the church.

The prefecture of Illyricum had but one exarch, the Bishop of Thessalonica, the metropolis of the Macedonian diocese. In the prefecture of Gaul there was no exarch, but in the two dioceses of Gaul and Spain as many metropolitans as provinces. Some there were, without all doubt, in the diocese of Britain, which was divided into five provinces, namely, Maxima Cæsariensis, Britannia Prima, Britannia Secunda, Valentia, and Flavia Cæsariensis. But in this island an entire change was made, by the Saxons, both in the ecclesiastical and civil polity.

Under the prefect of Italy were three dioceses, namely, Italy, West Illyricum, and West Africa. The diocese of Italy was divided into two vicarages, as I have observed above,

and governed by two vicars; the one called the vicar of Rome, and residing in that city, the other styled the vicar of Italy, and residing at Milan. Under the former were ten provinces, namely, Campania, Apulia, Lucania, Hetruria, Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Valeria; and seven under the latter, namely, Liguria, Æmilia, Flaminia or Picenum Annonarium, Venetia, Istria, Alpes Cottia, and the two Rhætia. Such was the civil government of Italy, and entirely agreeable to the civil was the ecclesiastical. Thus the Bishop of Rome enjoyed all the privileges of a metropolitan, with respect to the bishops of the provinces subject to the vicar of that city, or the suburbicarian provinces, as they are styled by Ruffinus. In like manner the Bishop of Milan exercised the power and authority of a metropolitan over all the bishops under the vicar of Italy. But the power of both was confined within the limits of their respective vicarages. As neither had the charge of a whole diocese, they were not, like several bishops in the east, distinguished with the title of exarch, which they had no right to, but with that only of metropolitan. However, the power of the Bishop of Rome far exceeded, within the bounds of his jurisdiction, that of other metropolitans, as I shall show hereafter.

In Africa the ecclesiastical polity varied greatly from the civil. Carthage, indeed, in the proconsular province of Africa, properly so called, was the metropolis of all West Africa, and the bishop of that city the primate and exarch. But in the other five provinces of that diocese, namely, Numidia, the two Mauritaniæ, Cæsariensis and Sitifensis, Tingitana, Bizacena, and Tripolitana, the senior bishop, in what city soever he presided, enjoyed the title and privileges of metropolitan, regard being had to his seniority, or the time of his ordination, and none to the dignity of his see. And hence it is that, at different times, we find bishops of different cities, within the same province, acting as metropolitans. Of West Illyricum, the third diocese under the prefect of Italy, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Some writers, namely, Petrus de Marca, Archbishop of Paris,<sup>1</sup> Christianus Lupus,<sup>2</sup> Emmanuel Schelstrat,<sup>3</sup> two eminent divines, the one of Louvain, the other of Antwerp, and Leo Allatius,<sup>4</sup> have taken a great deal of pains to prove, that these ecclesiastical dignities owe their origin to Christ, or the apostles. But their arguments are unanswerably confuted by the learned Ellies du Pin;<sup>5</sup> and besides, it is evident, from the entire conformity which the ecclesiastical government had, in most places, with the political state of the

<sup>1</sup> Pet. de Mar. l. 6, de conc. c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lup. can. 4; Nic. par. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Schel. antiq. illust. part. 1, disser. 1, c. 3, art. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Leo All. de eccl. occid. et orient. conses. l. 1, c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Du Pin de antiq. eccles. discipl. diss. 1, n. 6.



The new dignities added to the ancient hierarchy of the church. The rights and privileges of metropolitans. The rights and privileges of patriarchs, or exarchs. The Bishop of Rome not a patriarch.

empire, as established by Constantine, that the church, in forming the hierarchy I have described, adopted his plan; and consequently, that such dignities are not of divine, but of human institution. I might add, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the apostles, in appointing bishops, gave more power to one than to another, or any power at all to one over the others.

The new dignities or degrees, added to the ancient hierarchy of the church, in the fourth and following centuries, were those of Metropolitan, Primate, Archbishop, Exarch, and Patriarch. The title of Metropolitan was given to the bishop of the chief city of a province, and likewise that of Primate, he being *primus*, or the first of the province; for such was the original signification of that word in an ecclesiastical sense; but, in process of time, the title of Primate was restrained to the bishops of some great cities. On the contrary the title of Archbishop was originally bestowed on metropolitans only of great eminence and distinction; but, in the eighth century, it began to be given indifferently to all metropolitans, and even to some bishops, distinguished by no other title. As the bishop of the metropolis, or chief city, of a province, was dignified with the title of Metropolitan, so was the bishop of the metropolis, or chief city of a diocese, with that of Exarch; which, however, we find sometimes given to metropolitans. As for the title of Patriarch, it was first common to all bishops, but afterwards confined to the exarchs; and lastly, to the bishops of the five following cities, namely, Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. It was first bestowed on the Bishop of Rome, by the council of Chalcedon,<sup>1</sup> after it had been long common to all the exarchs of the east, as the learned Du Pin well observes.<sup>2</sup>

The titles of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, were not bare names of honor, but had several rights and prerogatives attending them. Thus the metropolitans and primates had, by their prerogative, a right to ordain the bishops of their respective provinces, to convene provincial synods, and to have a general superintendency or inspection over the whole province. The ordaining of bishops was a privilege common to the metropolitan, with the other bishops of the same province; but with this difference, that the presence, or at least the consent and approbation of the metropolitan was absolutely necessary; for, according to the fourth and sixth canons of the council of Nice, "He who was not ordained, or approved, by the metropolitan, was not to be a bishop." This privilege, was confirmed to the metropolitans by many subsequent councils, namely, by those of Arles, Laodicea, Carthage, Chalce-

don, Ephesus,<sup>1</sup> and many others. However, in the fifth century, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople began, in the east, to usurp this prerogative, pretending, that no bishops ought to be ordained in their respective dioceses, without their knowledge, consent, and approbation; and the patriarch of Rome, still more ambitious and encroaching, claimed a right to ordain the bishops throughout all the provinces of the west, which occasioned endless disputes, as we shall see in the sequel of this history. As to the second privilege peculiar to the metropolitans, they had a right to summon the bishops of their respective provinces to meet when they thought proper; to appoint the time and place of their meeting; to punish such as did not, without just cause, comply with their summons; and to preside in the assembly. The general care and inspection, which they were charged with over the whole province, imported, first, That all complaints against, all contests with or between the bishops of the province, were to be brought to their tribunal; and there heard, judged, and determined, not by the metropolitan alone, but by him and the other bishops of the province, in a provincial synod. Innumerable instances might be alleged of bishops thus deposed by their metropolitans. Secondly, The metropolitans had a right to receive appeals from the sentence of inferior bishops, and, with the other bishops, to confirm or reverse their decrees. And, lastly, each metropolitan was to keep a watchful eye over the bishops of his province, and take care that they discharged, as they ought, the functions of their office. These privileges were, in express terms, granted to the metropolitans, by almost innumerable councils, which it is needless and would be too tedious to name.

As for the patriarchs, or exarchs; by their prerogative, they were empowered to ordain the metropolitans, to convene diocesan synods, and to have a general superintendency over their respective dioceses, such as the metropolitans had over their respective provinces. The Bishop of Rome had not the charge of a whole diocese, and therefore was not, properly speaking, exarch or patriarch: his jurisdiction did not extend beyond the limits of the vicarage of Rome, or the suburbicarian provinces; and no instance can be produced of metropolitans or bishops ordained by him, out of those provinces, till the time of Valentinian III. Even in the vicarage of Italy the metropolitans of each province ordained all the bishops, and were themselves ordained by the bishops of the province. But over the suburbicarian provinces the Bishop of Rome exercised greater power and authority than the exarchs of the east did over the provinces of their dioceses; for the latter left the ordi-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4, col. 58; Evagr. l. 2, c. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Du Pin, c. 6, n. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Arel. can. 50; Laod. can. 12; Carth. can. 12; Eph. act. 4, &c.



The bishops of Rome have no right to ordain the metropolitans. The title of Archbishop a bare name of honour. The donation of all Italy to the pope, a forgery. Constantine baptized at Nicomedia, and not at Rome.

nation of the bishops to their metropolitans, whereas the former ordained not only the bishops of the metropolitan cities, but all those of the forementioned provinces: and the reason of this was, because these provinces had no metropolitans, to whom the ordination of bishops would of right have belonged; so that the prerogatives of the metropolitans were all vested in the Bishop of Rome alone. As there were no exarchs or patriarchs in the west, the bishops of each province were, by several councils, vested with the power of ordaining their own metropolitans; and that they were thus ordained in Gaul, Spain, and West Africa, is so manifest as to admit of no dispute.<sup>1</sup> And yet the sticklers for the see of Rome pretend the bishops of that city to have a divine and inherent right of ordaining all the metropolitans throughout the Christian world, by themselves, their vicars, or delegates. To maintain this chimerical right against the incontestable evidence of facts, they tell us, that the popes, for some ages, neglected to exert the power they had.<sup>2</sup> But from this charge all mankind will clear them, it being but too well known, that they never neglected the least opportunity of exerting to the utmost the power they had, and usurping the power they had not. But, cavils aside, it is evident beyond dispute, that the popes never knew, nor dreamt of, any such right or prerogative, till they were told of it by their flattering divines; at least Pope Leo, surnamed the Great, did not; for in one of his letters to the bishops of Gaul he disclaims, in express terms, the right of ordaining the bishops of that diocese.<sup>3</sup> To conclude, the Bishop of Rome was the only metropolitan in that vicarage; and, as such, had a right to ordain all the bishops of the suburbicarian provinces, or the provinces subject to the vicar of Rome; but, for a considerable tract of time, there is no instance of their ordaining either bishops or metropolitans out of that district.

As for the title of Archbishop, it is in itself a bare name of honor; whence, in some countries, especially in Italy, several are distinguished with that title, who indeed take place of, but have no power or authority over other bishops. And thus far of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as settled in the fourth and following centuries, of the different degrees that compose it, and the prerogatives peculiar to each degree, the knowledge whereof is absolutely necessary for the right understanding of the many contests and disputes in point of jurisdiction, which I shall have occasion to touch upon in the sequel of this history; for it was not at once, but by degrees, and not without great opposition, that the bishops of Rome, extending their authority beyond the limits of that vicarage, which was at that time the boundary of their jurisdiction, ac-

quired the unlimited power they now enjoy, with the arrogant title of Universal Bishop.

But to return to Sylvester, in whose pontificate this great change began; I need not employ many words to show the forgery of the so much boasted donation of all Italy, supposed to have been made by Constantine to Sylvester, in the spring of the year 324, four days after he had been baptized by that pontiff, since the instrument of that donation is now looked upon as supposititious, by all who have the least tincture of learning. The arguments they allege against it are: 1. That more than twelve copies of that instrument are still extant, all differing from one another. 2. That it evidently appears, from two constitutions of Constantine, still to be seen in the *Theodosian Code*,<sup>1</sup> that he was not at Rome, but at Thessalonica, in the spring of the year 324. 3. That neither Eusebius, who has given us a very minute and particular account of the actions of that prince, nor any other contemporary writer, has so much as hinted at so memorable a fact. 4. That all the ancient writers, both Greek and Latin, agree, that Constantine was not baptized at Rome, but at Nicomedia, when he lay at the point of death.<sup>2</sup> Let those who stand up in defence of that donation, give satisfactory answers to these reasons, and I shall conclude with them, that Italy being, by such a donation, disjoined from the empire, the emperors who succeeded Constantine had no claim or title to that country; that none of their constitutions were binding there; and consequently that, by the inhabitants of Italy, recourse ought to be had, in all cases, not to the civil, but to the canon law: for such pernicious doctrines have been broached, published, and maintained, as natural deductions from Constantine's great generosity to Sylvester.<sup>3</sup> In Rome is still to be seen, in a most sumptuous chapel, close to the Lateran, the baptistery or font in which Constantine is said to have been baptized. The chapel is adorned with noble paintings, representing that august ceremony, as performed by Sylvester, in the magnificent drapery and stately apparel of the present popes. Four days after this ceremony, Constantine, sensible of his obligations to Sylvester, rewarded him for his trouble with a fee, as Luchesini, the Scolopian, expresses it, answering in some degree to the greatness of the favour he had received at his hands; a fee worthy of so great a prince, of so great a pope.<sup>4</sup> The fee, which that writer, otherwise a man of learning, makes a long and tedious descant upon, was no less than the city of Rome, and all Italy. That

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. l. 4, de navicul. et l. un. de his qui veniam ætat.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Petr. de Marca, l. 3, c. 12, l. 6, c. 6; Schelstrat. antiq. illustr. par. 2, dissert. 3, c. 8; Got. in chron. cod. Theod. ann. 324; Euseb. vit. Const. l. 4, c. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Afflict. in constit. in prælud. quæst. 2, n. 2, et q. 20, n. 1; Tappia de jur. regni, l. 1, et de leg. l. 1, n. 6; Ponte de potest. Prærog. tit. 11. n. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Luch. de imp. potest. in Ital.

<sup>1</sup> Vide Du Pin. dissert. 1, n. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Leo, ep. 89.



What gave countenance to the custom of deferring baptism to the point of death. Spurious pieces ascribed to Sylvester.

Constantine was baptized at Nicomedia, and not at Rome, is affirmed, in express terms, by Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> Sozomen,<sup>2</sup> Socrates,<sup>3</sup> and Photius,<sup>4</sup> among the Greeks; and, among the Latins, by St. Ambrose,<sup>5</sup> St. Jerom,<sup>6</sup> and the council of Rimini.<sup>7</sup> Emmanuel Schelstrat, on one side, ashamed to reject, or even to question such authorities, but, on the other, unwilling to rob Sylvester of that glory, will have Constantine to have been baptized in both places. It is well known, says he, that Constantine, in the latter end of his life, was greatly biassed in favor of the Arians, and their tenets. Now a practice obtained among them of rebaptizing such as came over to their sect from the catholic church; and, to conform to this custom, Constantine was, in all likelihood, prevailed upon by Eusebius, the Arian bishop of Nicomedia, who assisted him on his death-bed.<sup>8</sup> Thus Schelstrat. But it is certain, that in Constantine's time, the Arians allowed the validity of baptism administered by the catholics; for, long after, we find St. Austin upbraiding them with the practice of rebaptizing, as a novelty lately introduced among them.<sup>9</sup> Besides, who is so little versed in the history of the church, as not to know that in those early times a very bad custom universally prevailed, at least among persons of distinction, who embraced the Christian religion, namely, that of putting off their baptism to their death-bed, or till they were upon the point of exposing themselves to some great danger? Thus Theodosius the Great, though he had not only openly professed the Christian religion, but given many instances of an extraordinary piety, yet did not choose to be baptized till he fell dangerously ill at Thessalonica.<sup>10</sup> In like manner Valentinian II. delayed his baptism till the approach of a battle with the barbarians, when he sent, in great haste, for St. Ambrose to administer that sacrament to him. But while the good bishop was crossing the Alps, on his way to Vienna, where the emperor then was, he received the melancholy news of his having been inhumanly murdered by some of his own officers, at the instigation of Arbogastus. His death was greatly lamented by St. Ambrose, who, in the elegant oration which he pronounced on occasion of his obsequies, maintained, that the fervent desire of baptism had the same effect as the sacrament itself; and consequently, that the sins of the deceased prince being thereby cancelled, it was not to be doubted, but from this life he had passed to eternal bliss.<sup>11</sup> Innumerable instances of the same nature occur in history, which were, it seems, utterly unknown to the

author of the Acts of Pope Sylvester, upon whose sole authority the fable has been credited of Constantine's receiving baptism at the hands of Sylvester, soon after his conversion. That impostor, whoever he was, is supposed to have lived in the eighth century, long after the custom of deferring baptism to the point of death had been utterly abolished. What gave countenance to such a custom was an opinion then generally received, and still held by the Church of Rome; namely, That by the waters of the sacred font men were washed clean, not only from the original, but from all other sins. This proved a great encouragement to vice, when piety began (and it began but too early) to decay among Christians; and therefore the fathers of the church, especially Basil, his brother Gregory, of Nyssa, and St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> employed all the oratory they were masters of, in crying down such a pernicious and wicked custom, as they style it; so that it was at last quite laid aside. Whether confession ought not, on the same account, to be put down, I shall leave the reader to judge; and only observe here, by the way, that had the virtue and efficacy ascribed now to confession, been known in those times, sinners needed not have delayed baptism to the point of death, since their sins had been no less effectually cancelled by confession than by baptism.

As for the letter from the council of Nice to Sylvester; his answer; the Acts of a council of two hundred and seventy-five bishops, supposed to have been held by him at the request of the fathers of Nice, to confirm their canons and decrees;<sup>2</sup> his letter to the bishops

<sup>1</sup> Greg. in orat. de bapt. Amb. in ser. de sanct. et alibi.

<sup>2</sup> The style of the letter from the council to Sylvester is quite barbarous and unintelligible. It begins thus: *Gloriam corroborata de Divinis mysteriis. Ecclesiasticæ utilitatis quæ ad robur pertinent ecclesiæ catholicæ et apostolicæ ad sedem tuam Romanam explanata et de Græco redacta scribere confitemur—nunc itaque ad vestræ sedis argumentum accurrimus roborari.* The rest is written in the same style; the consuls are called *sovereigns*, and the letter is dated five or six days after the opening of the council. The design of the impostor was to make the fathers of Nice recur to Sylvester for a confirmation of their decrees. Sylvester's answer is of a piece with the letter of the council; it supposes him to have added something to the council; mentions the cycle of Victorinus, who was not born in Sylvester's time, nor many years after; and bears a false date. As for the council said, and by some still maintained, to have been held at Rome, to confirm the canons of Nice, it was utterly unknown to all the ancients. And who can believe that none of the ancients should ever have heard of a council held in the metropolis of the empire, and consisting, as we are told, of two hundred and seventy-five bishops, or, if they had heard of it, that they would never have mentioned it? Besides, it is said to have been held at Rome, in the presence of Constantine; and it is certain that the emperor was not in Rome at the time the council is supposed to have been held. The canons, which are supposed to have been made on this occasion, contain regulations repugnant to the practice of those times, and which it was then impossible to observe. The first canon relates to the time when Easter was to be kept; but what is there determined no man can know. The second is no less unintelligible than the first: *Ut unusquisque episcopus rediens ad parochiam suam compaginem salutationis plebi tuæ innotescat.* These are the words of this canon. The third forbids the ecclesiastics to appear before secular judges, let the action be what it will; which is repugnant to the discipline of those times.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 2, c. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Socr. l. 1, c. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Phot. cod. 127.

<sup>5</sup> Ambros. serm. de obitu Theodos.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. in chron.

<sup>7</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 18.

<sup>8</sup> Schelst. antiq. illust. part 2, dissert. 3, c. 6.

<sup>9</sup> Aug. de hæres. c. 43.

<sup>10</sup> Socr. l. 5, c. 6; Sozom. l. 7, c. 4.

<sup>11</sup> Amb. orat. in fun. Val.



The Bishop of Rome ordained by the Bishop of Ostia. Julius is falsely said to have held a great council at Rome. The Arians write to Julius against Athanasius.

of Gaul, in favor of the church of Vienne; the Acts of two other councils, said to have been held by him at Rome; they are all pieces universally rejected by men of learning, and deemed no less fabulous than the instrument of Constantine's donation, and that prince's journey with Sylvester to the council of Nice, as it is related in the Acts of the latter, even in those which F. Combesis published in

1660. They are in Greek, and that writer undertakes to defend them as genuine;<sup>1</sup> but we need no other proof than the account they give of that journey, to conclude them incapable of being defended. Sylvester died on the 31st of December, 335, after having governed the church of Rome for the space of twenty-one years and eleven months.<sup>2</sup>

## MARK, THIRTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.]

[Year of Christ 336.] SYLVESTER was succeeded by Mark, on the 18th of January, 336. He is passed over by Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> but named by Optatus,<sup>2</sup> Ruffinus,<sup>3</sup> St. Austin,<sup>4</sup> St. Jerom,<sup>5</sup> and Sozomen.<sup>6</sup> We know nothing certain either of his life or administration. Anastasius indeed tells us, that by him the Bishop of Ostia was first appointed to ordain the Bishop of Rome, and to carry the pallium or pall; where Baronius observes, that the pall is here mentioned for the first time.<sup>7</sup> But Anastasius is not a writer we can depend upon. It is certain, however, that the bishops of Ostia have long enjoyed this privilege; for it is mentioned by St. Austin,<sup>8</sup> and likewise in a memorial presented by the clergy of

Rome, in 418, to the Emperor Honorius, on occasion of the election of Pope Zosimus.<sup>3</sup> The letter which the bishops of Egypt are said to have written to this pope, and his answer to them, are rejected even by Baronius,<sup>4</sup> and very justly; for the pope's answer is dated eighteen days after his death. He died on the 7th of October, the same year he had been chosen,<sup>5</sup> and was buried in the cemetery of Balbina, which was thenceforth called after his name.<sup>6</sup> His body is now worshipped in the church of St. Lawrence, at Florence, though no mention is made by any writer of its having ever been translated thither.<sup>7</sup>

## JULIUS, THIRTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, and his three sons, CONSTANTINE, CONSTANTIUS, and CONSTANS.]

[Year of Christ 337.] UPON the death of Mark the see was vacant for the space of four months, that is, to the 6th of February, 337, when Julius was chosen.<sup>9</sup> He is said to have held a council of a hundred and sixteen bishops in the December of the same year.<sup>10</sup> But the date of this council puts Baronius to a stand; for in the date are marked the consuls, the year of the emperors, and the indiction. Now, according to the consuls, it must have been held in 337; according to the

year of the emperors, in 340; and, according to the indiction, in 347. The annalist spares neither his words nor his labor to solve, or rather to patch up, this difficulty; but, being sensible, after a long, tedious, and puzzling descant, that he labours in vain, he concludes, that the text has been altered.<sup>8</sup> He might have saved himself a great deal of trouble, by owning at once what has been plainly proved since by Blondel,<sup>9</sup> namely, that no such council was ever held.

When Julius was raised to the pontificate, the celebrated Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, lived in banishment at Treves; but the year following he was allowed to return to his church by the three emperors, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, who had suc-

The fourth will have those who enter themselves among the clergy, to pass through all the degrees, and fixes the time which they are to continue in each degree. They are to be janitors or door-keepers one year, lectors or readers twenty, exorcists ten, acolytes five, subdeacons five, deacons five, and priests six; so that none under threescore could attain to the episcopal dignity; which is highly absurd in itself, and contrary to the practice of those times.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Ruffin. l. 10, c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. chron.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 336, n. 64.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> Opt. l. 2, p. 48.

<sup>7</sup> Aug. ep. 165.

<sup>8</sup> Soz. l. 2, c. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Aug. coll. die 3, c. 16.

<sup>10</sup> Concil. tom. 2, p. 527.

<sup>1</sup> Comb. act., &c., p. 258.

<sup>2</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 267, 273.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Du Pin, dissert. 1, n. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 336, n. 60, 61.

<sup>5</sup> Soz. l. 2, c. 20; Hier. chron. Buch. p. 267, 273.

<sup>6</sup> Front. cal. p. 141.

<sup>7</sup> Bolland. Pont. p. 50.

<sup>8</sup> Bar. ad ann. 337, n. 67.

<sup>9</sup> Blond. decret. p. 451.



The Arians desire Julius to assemble a council. They decline appearing at the council of Rome; assemble one at Antioch; and there depose Athanasius. Neither Athanasius nor any other bishop restored by Julius.

ceeded their father in 337. The Eusebians, that is, the Arian faction headed by Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, at whose instigation he had been banished by Constantine, alarmed at his return, wrote bitter letters against him to the three princes, and likewise to the Bishop of Rome. To the latter they despatched with their letters Macarius a presbyter, and the two deacons, Martyrius and Hesychius. Athanasius no sooner heard of this embassy than he, in his turn, despatched some presbyters to oppose the attempts of his enemies, and defend his innocence against the calumnies which he well knew they were sent to spread against him, not only at Rome, but all over the west.<sup>1</sup> Upon their arrival, Macarius privately withdrew from Rome, and the other two were so confounded by the deputies of Athanasius, at a private conference held before the pope, that, to gain time, they had no other resource but to appeal to a council, which they begged the pope to assemble, and to give timely notice thereof both to Athanasius and the Eusebians. They bragged that, before the council, they would make good the charge they had brought against Athanasius, and offered to take Julius himself for their judge.<sup>2</sup> This offer, we may be sure, was readily accepted by the Bishop of Rome, who immediately wrote to Athanasius inviting him to the council, and at the same time desired the deputies of the Eusebians to acquaint their party, that, agreeably to their request, a council should be soon convened. Athanasius, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, set out, without delay, for Rome, where he arrived in the latter end of the year 339. After his arrival, the Bishop of Rome despatched Elpidius and Philoxenes, two of his presbyters, with letters to the Eusebians, summoning them to the council, which their deputies had demanded, and acquainting them with the time and place in which it was to be held.<sup>3</sup> The place was Rome, and the time the month of June, 341, according to the most probable opinion. The other bishops assembled at the time appointed; but the Eusebians, instead of appearing at the council of Rome, which had been convened at their request, assembled one at Antioch, and there, without waiting for the determination of Julius, whom they had chosen for their judge, they deposed Athanasius, and appointed Gregory bishop of Alexandria in his room; nay, they even detained the deputies sent by the pope till the time appointed for the meeting of the council was expired, that they might afterwards plead, as they did, the shortness of the term prescribed for them to meet in.<sup>4</sup> In the council of Rome the cause of Athanasius was examined, and he, after the strictest scrutiny, declared innocent with one voice by the fifty bishops who

composed it;<sup>1</sup> so that Julius and the rest continued to communicate with him as a bishop,<sup>2</sup> which was declaring him unlawfully deposed. Several other bishops, who had been deposed by the Arians, came to lay their complaints before the council, and, among the rest, Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, and Paul bishop of Constantinople. The former had been condemned as a heretic by a council held at Constantinople in 336, and consisting entirely of Arian bishops. As nobody appeared against him during the fifteen months he continued at Rome, and the declaration of his faith, which, at the request of Julius, he gave under his own hand, was judged quite orthodox by the pope and the council, he was readmitted to the communion of the catholic church.<sup>3</sup> But whether they did not judge too favorably of his belief, may be very much questioned: Epiphanius at least was noways satisfied with it.<sup>4</sup> And truly it would be no easy task to clear him from the heresy of Sabellius and Samosatenus, denying the trinity of the Divine Persons:<sup>5</sup> but to examine so perplexed and intricate a point would be foreign to my purpose. Socrates<sup>6</sup> and Sozomen<sup>7</sup> write, that Julius, by the authority of his see, reinstated all the bishops who had been displaced by the Arians; that he supported and defended their innocence with letters full of vigor and liberty; severely reprimanded those who had deposed them; summoned some of them to appear at Rome, in a limited time, to justify their conduct; and, lastly, that he threatened to treat them as they deserved, if they did not forbear raising disturbances in the church. In virtue of these letters, says Socrates, the bishops were restored to their sees. But Sozomen names only Athanasius, and Paul bishop of Constantinople. It is surprising, that the advocates for the see of Rome should allege the testimony of these two writers, to prove that the authority of the Bishop of Rome was acknowledged by the orientals; that his jurisdiction was universal; when they themselves must know (for I cannot suppose them so ignorant as not to know) that the historians whom they quote were grossly mistaken. For it is manifest from Athanasius,<sup>8</sup> that Julius wrote only two letters to the Eusebians; one before the council met, inviting them to it; and the other, while the council was still sitting, which I shall speak of hereafter; and in neither of these does Julius take upon him either to threaten or command. The above-mentioned historians seem to have jumbled these two letters together, and to have made a third out of them, with some improvements of their own. As to his restoring the deposed

<sup>1</sup> Athan. apol. 2, p. 741—745.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. Socr. l. 2, c. 15; Soz. l. 3, c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ib. p. 744, et ad Solit. p. 816.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. apol. 2, p. 748.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. Hil. frag. p. 26.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. p. 750.

<sup>4</sup> Epiph. 72, c. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Petav. dog. t. 2, l. 1, c. 13; Hilar. de Trin. l. 7, p. 46.

<sup>6</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 15.

<sup>7</sup> Soz. l. 3, c. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Athan. apol. 2, p. 739.



The Eusebians write to Julius; and threaten to separate themselves from his communion. Julius's answer to their letter. The council of Sardica.

bishops to their sees, it is certain he did not, since Athanasius continued in the west till the year 349, when he was restored by the council of Sardica. Paul indeed was reinstated sooner, but not till the see of Constantinople became vacant by the death of Eusebius, who had been translated from Nicomedia to that city. I appeal to the Roman Catholics themselves, and leave them to judge whether it is at all probable, that the Emperor Constantius, and the oriental bishops, incensed as they were against Paul and Athanasius, whom they had condemned and deposed in two synods, should, out of respect to the pope, suffer them thus tamely to return to their sees, and drive out those whom they had placed in their room. This had been owning themselves guilty, and reversing the sentence they had but lately pronounced, which, as will appear, they were noways in a humor to do.

While the council of Rome was yet sitting, the pope's two deputies, Elpidius and Philoxenes, returning from the east, delivered to Julius a letter from the Eusebians, which may pass for a masterpiece of the kind; for, without departing from, or intrenching upon, the respect that was due to the bishop of the imperial city, they, at the same time, commend, censure, menace, and rally him in a most cruel manner. They begin with alleging several frivolous excuses for not appearing at the council, such as the Persian war, which, by the way, did not prevent their assembling at Antioch; the shortness of the term prescribed for their meeting; the pope's writing only to some of them, and not to all, as he ought to have done; and finally, his writing to them in his own name alone, which was tacitly taxing him with taking too much upon him. They then launch out ironically, it seems, into the highest encomiums on the Church of Rome, styling her the first of all churches, the school of the apostles, the metropolis of true piety. However, the first preachers of the gospel, add they, came out of the east; and, after all, we ought to be looked upon as inferiors to none, though perhaps we may not have such numerous and flourishing churches as some have, since the want of numbers may be abundantly supplied by the piety of a few. As to rank, we are all equal, the greatness of the cities, in which we preside, adding nothing to the dignity we all enjoy. In the next place, they express great concern at the little regard shown by some to the decisions of councils, which ought to be revered by all, and deemed immutable. This was modestly censuring the pope for not acquiescing to the decrees of the councils of Tyre and Constantinople condemning Athanasius. In the end they allege several things both against Athanasius, and Marcellus bishop of Ancyra; and conclude with telling Julius, that if he renounced all correspondence and intercourse with the bishops they had deposed, and acknowledged

those they had placed in their room, they would continue to communicate with him; but if he refused to comply with their decisions and decrees, they should think themselves obliged to act in a very different manner.<sup>1</sup> Julius was so mortified with this letter, that he suppressed it for some time, hoping the Eusebians would send deputies, who, he presumed, would express their sentiments by word of mouth, and in a different style. But, none appearing, he was obliged to lay the letter he had received before the fathers of the council, who, after expressing the greatest indignation against the Eusebians, advised the pope to answer it; which he did accordingly, by that excellent letter, which has been preserved entire among the works of Athanasius. He begins with complaining, in very modest terms, of the animosity they betrayed in their letter, to which he thought he had given no occasion; unless they had taken it amiss, that he had summoned them to the council; which he could not persuade himself they did, since, at the request of their deputies, he had appointed the council to meet, and, at their request, invited them to it. As for the regard due to the decrees and decisions of councils, he told them, that they had trespassed the first against the decrees of the œcumenical council of Nice, by admitting the Arians to their communion, which he conceived to be more criminal in them, than it was in him to receive Athanasius and Marcellus. He reproaches them with another transgression of the canons of the church, namely, with that of passing from one bishopric to another, which Eusebius had done. He then justifies his conduct with regard to Athanasius and Marcellus; exhorts the Eusebians, with great zeal and earnestness, to find out some remedy against the evils and disorders that reigned in the east, which he describes at length; and concludes with complaining of the orientals for condemning and deposing bishops, those especially of the apostolic sees, without the concurrence or knowledge of their brethren in the west.<sup>2</sup>

Julius, finding his letter made no impression on the Eusebians, applied with several other bishops to the Emperor Constans, who, at their request, proposed to his brother Constantius the assembling of an œcumenical council, in order to put an end to those unhappy divisions. To this proposal Constantius agreed; and accordingly, by the command of the two princes, a numerous council met in 347, at Sardica, the metropolis of Dacia in Illyricum.<sup>3</sup> Julius, apprehending it dangerous to abandon his flock at that juncture, did not assist in person, but by his deputies Archidamus and Philoxenes, who signed in

<sup>1</sup> Athan. apol. 2, p. 740—749, et ad Solit. p. 816; Soz. 1. 3, c. 8; Euseb. l. 6, c. 43; Hil. frag. p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. ib. p. 740—753.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ib. p. 761; Soz. 1. 1, c. 20; Hil. frag. 2, p. 7; Soz. 1. 3, c. 12, &c.



Canons of the council of Sardica relating to the Bishop of Rome. The practice of appealing to the pope first introduced. The popes claim as their original right, what was granted them as a favor.

his name.<sup>1</sup> The orientals came, but withdrew soon after, upon the council's refusing to exclude Athanasius, and some others, whom they had condemned.<sup>2</sup> But by the orthodox bishops, who remained, the acts of the council of Rome were confirmed, Athanasius and three other bishops declared innocent; and those who had been placed in their room, not only deposed, but anathematized, and entirely cut off from the communion of the Catholic church.<sup>3</sup> The council, before they broke up, wrote several letters; and, among the rest, one to the emperors; one to the Bishop of Rome; and a circular letter to all the bishops of the Catholic church, acquainting them with what had passed, and exhorting them to join the council, and declare to the world, that they accepted their decrees by subscribing to them.<sup>4</sup> The circular letter was subscribed first by the great Osius bishop of Cordoua, and in the second place by the pope's legates.<sup>5</sup> In their letter to Julius they beg him to notify their decrees to the bishops of Sardinia, Sicily, and Italy, lest any of them should receive letters of peace and communion from the bishops they had condemned.<sup>6</sup> In this letter the council says, or rather is made to say, that "it is very meet or reasonable, that all bishops should acquaint their head, that is, the see of St. Peter, with what passes in their respective provinces."<sup>7</sup> I agree with Blondel,<sup>8</sup> that this passage is foisted in; but cannot acquiesce to the only reason he alleges to support his opinion, namely, the barbarity of the Latin expression, (*valde congruentissimum est*;) for such a slip might easily escape men wholly bent on defending the truth, and speaking it; and besides, we are not certain, that this letter was originally written in Latin. The want of connection between that sentence and what is said both before and after it, is, I think, a more convincing proof of forgery.

By the council of Sardica several canons were made; but I shall only take notice of those that regard the Bishop of Rome. By the third canon in the Greek, or the fourth in the Latin translation by Isidorus, it is ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, his judges shall acquaint the Bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order his cause to be re-examined by such of the neighboring bishops as he shall think fit to name.<sup>9</sup> Osius, who was greatly addicted to the see of Rome, begged the council to grant this honor to the memory of St. Peter. The fourth canon, according to the Greek, adds, that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant till his cause shall be judged by the Bishop of Rome. By the fifth canon, which by some mistake is

the seventh in Dionysius Exiguus, it is ordered, that if a bishop, condemned in his own province, shall choose to be judged by the Bishop of Rome, and desires him to appoint some of his presbyters to judge him in his name, together with the bishops, the Bishop of Rome may grant him his request. Thus was the pernicious practice of appealing to the pope first introduced and authorized. It must be observed, that the oriental bishops had all left the council: those who remained were all zealous opposers of Arianism. At the head of their party was the Bishop of Rome. In the heat of their zeal they thought they could not confer too much power upon him; and so made a concession entirely repugnant to the discipline of the primitive church, and which he could never have obtained, had not those dispositions worked strongly in his favour. This will not be surprising to those, who have attended to history, and seen how much the ambition of princes and heads of factions is often advanced beyond its due bounds by the indiscreet fervor of party zeal. To the council of Sardica, acting under this influence, the see of Rome is indebted for the so much boasted privilege of receiving appeals; and Julius was very thankful for it. But his successors, looking upon such an obligation as a diminution of their pretended sovereignty, have had the assurance to claim it as their original right: but that such a right was unknown to their great friend Osius, to the fathers of the council, nay, and to the pope himself, and his legates, is manifest, since what they now claim as their original and inherent right, was by Osius begged of the council as a favor, and, as such, granted by the council, and accepted by the pope and his legates. This power of receiving appeals, only with respect to the judging and deposing of bishops, has been extended by the popes to all causes; and great encouragement has been given to such as recurred to their tribunal on the slightest occasions. "Concerning appeals in the smallest causes, we would have you to know, that the same regard is to be had to them, for how slight a matter soever they be made, as if they were for a greater," says Pope Alexander III. in his letter to the Bishop of Worcester.<sup>1</sup> The scandalous and intolerable abuse of this power in the popes has obliged several princes, even when superstition most prevailed, to restrain their subjects by severe laws from recurring to Rome. Nay, other councils of far greater authority than that of Sardica, finding no other means to put a stop to the daily encroachments of the see of Rome, have thought it necessary to revoke the privilege, which that council had too rashly granted, as we shall see in the sequel of the present history.

It had been decreed but six years before,

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ap. 2, p. 767.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 819; Hil. frag. 2, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ib. p. 766, et ad Sol. p. 820; Theod. 1. 2, c. 6; Hil. frag. 1, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib. p. 767.

<sup>6</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 15, 16.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>8</sup> Blond. prim. p. 106.

<sup>9</sup> Concil. t. 2, p. 652.

<sup>1</sup> In decret. Greg. 1. 2, tit. 23, c. 11.



Decrees of the council of Antioch revoked by the council of Sardica. Osius did not preside as the pope's legate. Athanasius retires to Naissus. Is recalled by Constantius. Ursacius and Valens retract. Julius dies.

by the council of Antioch, that, if the bishops of the same province disagreed in judging one of their brethren, the metropolitan might call in those of the neighboring province to judge with them; but if they agreed, and were unanimous either in condemning or absolving, their judgment should be irreversible. Both these decrees were revoked by the present council, though entirely agreeable to the ancient practice and discipline of the church. But yet this council, however favorable to the pope, did not grant him the power of summoning bishops to Rome, in order to be judged there by him. He was only empowered to examine the judgment given in the province; and, in case he found it to be wrong, to order another in the same province, to invite to this new synod the bishops of the next province, and to send his legates to it as he thought fit.

At this council the pope's legates assisted; but Osius presided, as we are told in express terms by Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> by Sozomen,<sup>2</sup> and by the fathers of the council of Chalcedon.<sup>3</sup> Besides, his name is the first in the subscriptions, as they have been transmitted to us by Athanasius, who assures us, that Osius was the chief, and presided in all the councils at which he assisted. He signed the first, and in his own name: after him signed the legates, not in their own, but in the pope's name; *Julius Romæ per Archidamum et Philoxenum, Presbyteros*; which is a sufficient confutation of De Marca, and the other popish writers, pretending, without the least foundation, that Osius presided in the name of Julius.

It is to be observed, that the canons of this council were never received in the east, nor even in the west, by the bishops of Africa; and that they were not inserted by the council of Chalcedon into the code of canons approved by them, as rules to be universally observed: so that, after all, the so much boasted council of Sardica is a council of no great authority. Of this the popes themselves were well apprized; and therefore, recurring to fraud, attempted, as we shall see hereafter, to impose upon the world the canons of Sardica as the canons of Nice.

Athanasius, though declared innocent by the council, did not think it advisable to return to his see, being informed that the Eusebians had prevailed upon the Emperor Constantius to issue an order empowering and commanding the magistrates of Alexandria to put him to death, without further trial, in what place soever he should be found within the precincts of that jurisdiction.<sup>4</sup> He therefore retired to Naissus, in Upper Dacia, and there continued from the year 347 to 349, when Constantius chose rather to recall him, and the other exiled bishops, than engage in a civil war, with which he was threatened by

his brother, if he did not.<sup>1</sup> Before his departure for the east he went to Rome, to take his leave of that church, and his great protector Julius, who, on that occasion, wrote an excellent letter of congratulation to the presbyters, deacons, and people of Alexandria. Of this letter we have two copies, the one in Socrates,<sup>2</sup> and the other in Athanasius.<sup>3</sup> The former contains great commendations of that prelate, which, out of modesty, were, as I conjecture, omitted by him.

Julius had, soon after, the satisfaction of receiving a solemn retraction made by Ursacius, bishop of Singidunum, and Valens, bishop of Mursus, two of Athanasius's most inveterate enemies, publicly owning, that whatever they had said or written against him was utterly false, groundless, and invented out of pure malice: at the same time they embraced his communion, and anathematized the heresy of Arius, and all who held or defended his tenets. This act Valens wrote with his own hand, and Ursacius signed it; whereupon they were both admitted by Julius to the communion of the church.<sup>4</sup> This retraction, though not at all sincere, but merely owing to policy, greatly contributed to the justification of Athanasius. I find nothing else in the ancients concerning Julius worthy of notice. He died on the 12th of April, 352, having governed the Church of Rome fifteen

<sup>1</sup> Ath. ad Sol. p. 822; Ruf. l. 1, c. 19; Theod. l. 2, c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. apol. 2, p. 770.

<sup>4</sup> Ath. ad Solit. p. 826, et Apol. 2, p. 776; Hil. frag. 1, p. 24—26.

Ursacius and Valens first abjured, or rather pretended to abjure, their errors at Milan, before the council, that at this time was sitting there. From Milan they repaired to Rome, and there abjured anew their errors, in the presence of Julius, and the whole Roman church. Here Baronius observes, "that as this was a matter of too great moment to be finally decided by the council of Milan, though the Roman presbyters were present, they sent them to Julius, that they might abjure their errors in his presence, agreeably to the ancient custom of the Catholic church; namely, that eminent heretics should abjure their heresies only at Rome." (Bar. ad ann. 350, n. 23.) But, in the first place, they were not sent by the council; but went to Rome of their own accord, as Osius assures us, in express terms, *Illi ultro Roman venerunt*. (Apud Ath. ad Solitar.) In the second place, the matter was finally determined by the council of Milan; for the council received their recantations, and restored them to the communion of the church. And what else was to be done? what else could Julius do? But if the matter was finally determined by the council, what could induce them, says Baronius, to travel to Rome, and abjure anew their heresy there? The answer is obvious: They had imposed upon the council by a pretended abjuration, and went to Rome to impose, in like manner, on Julius, and obtain by that means his communion; which they did accordingly, notwithstanding his *infallibility*. Besides, as both Athanasius and his enemies had referred their cause to the arbitration of Julius, he was the fittest person to receive the retraction of the false evidence which they had formerly given. As to the custom mentioned by Baronius, "that eminent heretics should abjure their heresies only at Rome," no man can be so little versed in ecclesiastical history as not to know that no such custom ever obtained in the Catholic church. Not to recur to more ancient times, the Arian bishops, that is, bishops guilty of the same heresy as Ursacius and Valens, abjured their errors before the council that was held at Jerusalem, in 335. There they renounced their heresy; there they were all restored to the communion of the church, without going, or offering to go to Rome. And many of those bishops were surely more eminent heretics than either Ursacius or Valens.

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret, l. 2, c. 15.    <sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 3, c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. l. 4, p. 825.

<sup>4</sup> Ath. apol. 2, p. 271, et ad Sol. p. 820.



Julius not banished by Constantius. Liberius his own panegyrist. The Eusebians write a second letter to Julius against Athanasius: which is answered by Liberius: who summons Athanasius to Rome.

years, two months, and six days.<sup>1</sup> He is said to have been buried in the cemetery of Callistus, on the Aurelian Way, where he had built a church,<sup>2</sup> and to have been removed from thence, in 817, by Pope Paschal I., to the church of St. Praxedes; and again from that, by Innocent II., in 1140, to St. Mary's beyond the Tiber.<sup>3</sup> Bede, whom the authors of the modern pontificals have followed, tells us, in his Martyrology,<sup>4</sup> that Julius was sent into banishment, where he suffered much for the space of ten months, till the death of Constantius, a zealous promoter of Arianism. But that historian was certainly mistaken, since Constantius was never master of Rome in Julius's time, and his brother Constans was a great friend to Julius, and all the orthodox bishops. Of the many writings ascribed to Julius, none, except his two letters, are authentic, the one to the Eusebians, and the other to the Church of Alexandria, of which we have spoken above. Leontius, of Byzan-

tium, mentions seven epistles, which, in the latter end of the sixth century, were ascribed to Julius;<sup>1</sup> but, at the same time, he assures us, that they were not written by him, but by Apollinaris the heresiarch; and the monks of Palestine, in the account they gave of the Eutychians, in the time of the Emperor Anastasius, assure us, that they seduced great numbers of people, by ascribing the works of Apollinaris to the fathers, namely, to Athanasius, to Gregory Nazienzen, and to Julius.<sup>2</sup> Gennadius ascribes to Julius a letter to Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, greatly savoring of the heresy of Eutyches and Timotheus;<sup>3</sup> but Leontius, of Byzantium, evidently proves that letter to have been written by Apollinaris; and as his it is quoted by his two disciples, Valentine and Timotheus.<sup>4</sup> The orientals have a liturgy which they suppose to have been composed by Julius: this supposition, however groundless, shows him to have been in great repute in those parts.<sup>5</sup>

## LIBERIUS, THIRTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, JOVIAN, VALERIAN.]

[Year of Christ 352.] LIBERIUS was chosen on the 22d of May, 352, in the room of Julius.<sup>5</sup> He had trampled under foot, (to use his own terms,) all worldly things, to observe the gospel, and obey the dictates of his faith. He had been employed, before his election, in several ecclesiastical ministries, and discharged them with reputation, though he was not conscious to himself of having ever done the least thing for the sake of praise and glory. He was at last raised to the episcopal dignity, but much against his will, as he calls God and the church to witness. He protests, that it was his ardent and only wish, that he might keep himself pure and undefiled in the administration of his new dignity, that he might inviolably maintain and defend the faith, which he had received from his illustrious predecessors, among whom were many martyrs.<sup>6</sup> Were we to judge of his conduct from his words, we should equal him to the best of his predecessors; but there appears, throughout his whole administration, such an odd mixture of opposite qualities, that it is no easy matter to form a true idea of his character; at one time we shall find him bold, intrepid, and inflexible; at another timorous, faint-hearted, and compliant; insomuch that one can hardly conceive him to be the same man. The latter qualities he betrayed in the very beginning of his pontificate, by separating himself from the communion of Athanasius.

Constans, the great support of the orthodox party, being murdered, and Constantius upon the point of becoming master of Rome, by a complete victory he had gained over the two brothers Magnentius and Decentius, the Eusebians thought this a proper juncture to try whether the fear of that prince had not rendered Julius somewhat more tractable. For Constantius was more incensed than ever against Athanasius, being assured by the Eusebians, to whom he gave an entire credit, that he had influenced his brother to threaten him with a civil war.<sup>6</sup> They wrote therefore to Julius a second letter, filled with new complaints and calumnies against Athanasius; but Julius dying in the mean time, their letter, together with another to the same purpose from the Arians of Alexandria, was delivered to Liberius, who caused them both to be publicly read in a full assembly of the people, and in the council, which was then sitting at Rome.<sup>7</sup> His answer to these letters has not reached our times; but a copy of the letter, which he wrote on that occasion to Athanasius, has, to his eternal disgrace, been transmitted to us, among the fragments of Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers. In that letter he summons him to appear forthwith at Rome, to clear himself there of the heavy accusations brought against him; and threatens to cut

<sup>1</sup> Leont. sect. 8, p. 526.

<sup>2</sup> Evagr. l. 3, c. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Leont. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Bona lit. 1, c. 9, p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> Ath. ad Solit. p. 823, et Apol. 2, p. 674; Theod. l. 2, c. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 36, 40.

<sup>1</sup> Buch. cycl. 267, 273.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Bolland. 12 Apr. p. 86, n. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Bed. martyr. p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> Buch. cycl. p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 41.



Liberius communicates with the Arians, and excommunicates Athanasius. His letter to them not supposititious. The Council of Arles. The Emperor's edict. The Pope's legates sign the condemnation of Athanasius.

him off from the communion of that church, if he refused to comply with the summons.<sup>1</sup> With this letter he despatched three of his presbyters, Lucius, Paulus, and Ælianus; strictly enjoining them, by all means, to prevail upon Athanasius to repair, without delay, to Rome.<sup>2</sup> This conduct, so very different from that of his predecessor, was, no doubt, owing to the dread he was in of the Emperor Constantius, by this time probably master of Rome and all Italy; for what else could tempt or induce him to act so preposterously? Be that as it will, Athanasius was greatly surprised and concerned to find himself so unworthily treated and threatened by the Bishop of Rome; but did not think himself, on that account, obliged to abandon his flock. He remained therefore in Alexandria; but begged his colleagues in Egypt to write in his favor to the pope, which they did accordingly. But Liberius wanted to ingratiate himself with the Arians, and, by their means, with the emperor; and therefore, without any regard to the testimony of the orthodox bishops, or the known innocence of the oppressed Athanasius, he wrote to the Eusebians, acquainting them that he communicated with them; but, as to Athanasius, he had cut him off from his communion, and from that of his church.<sup>3</sup> Baronius,<sup>4</sup> and after him the Benedictines, in their last edition of the works of Hilarius and Athanasius,<sup>5</sup> maintain this letter of Liberius to have been forged by the Arians, and inserted into the works of Hilarius. But they allege no convincing reason why the other pieces, among which it has been conveyed to us, should be admitted as genuine, and this alone rejected as supposititious. Athanasius, indeed, never reproached the Bishop of Rome with his scandalous conduct, as they observe; but may not that be ascribed to his moderation? The more, as he was sensible that Liberius acted thus not out of ill will, but fear. As to the want of connection between that letter and the pieces preceding and following it, I should not have expected such an objection from any who had ever perused the fragments of that writer, which every one knows to have been patched together without any regard to time or order.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 36, 40.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 352, n. 12—20

<sup>5</sup> Hil. p. 1327, et Athan. vit. p. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Thus the very letter of Liberius is put in the place where the letter of the council of Sardica to the Emperor Constantius ought to have been, as is manifest from what is said immediately before it. A few lines after, instead of the letter from the council of Egypt to Liberius, which Hilarius promises, we find one from Liberius to the bishops of Italy, written after the death of Constantius upon a quite different subject. What comes immediately after the letter of Liberius to the Eusebians, ought, in all likelihood, to have been placed after the above-mentioned letter of the council of Sardica to Constantius: for to me it appears no less improbable than it does or can do to Baronius, (Bar. ad ann. 352, n. 13,) that Hilarius, a most zealous stickler for the orthodox faith, should approve of the pope's scandalous letter, tending utterly to subvert it, and express his approbation in these terms: "What is there in this letter that

In the mean time Constantius, now in quiet possession of the whole empire by the death of Magnentius, who, after his defeat, had laid violent hands on himself, summoned a council to meet at Arles. At this council Liberius did not assist in person, but by his legates, Vincentius bishop of Capua, and Marcellus bishop of Campania, who, together with some others, had been sent by Liberius some time before to meet the emperor at Arles, and beg him in the pope's name to assemble a council at Aquileia.<sup>1</sup> As the Bishop of Capua was a man of great parts, and long experience, Liberius reposed an entire confidence in him, not doubting but he would maintain the dignity of his legation, and support the innocence of Athanasius with that firmness which he had shown on several other occasions.<sup>2</sup>

As the council consisted chiefly of Arians, their great point in view was, to extort from the Italian bishops a solemn condemnation of Athanasius. This, therefore, was in the first place proposed in the council; and, because the orthodox bishops would not consent to it, an edict was issued by the emperor, sentencing all those to exile who should refuse to sign the condemnation of Athanasius.<sup>3</sup> The boasted firmness and constancy of Vincentius were not proof against such a trial. He did all that lay in his power to divert the emperor from the execution of a decree utterly inconsistent with the liberty of a council; but finding him deaf to all remonstrances, he began to capitulate, offering to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, on condition the Eusebians signed that of Arius, and publicly abjured his doctrine. This he thought would be some alleviation of his guilt, and therefore the proposal which he had made by word of mouth he gave in writing to the heads of the Ariian faction, signed by himself and his fellow-legates. But the Arians, too well acquainted with their weakness to grant them any terms, peremptorily insisted upon their condemning Athanasius, and referring the cause and doctrine of Arius to a more proper juncture. Vincentius and his colleagues, finding the enemies of Athanasius thus inflexible, and, on the other hand, determined at all events to keep their bishoprics, and avoid the hardships of a painful exile, complied at last, and "yielded to the troublesome times," to use their softening expression.<sup>4</sup>

is not holy? What is there that does not proceed from the fear of God?" However, I cannot conclude, and much less demonstratively, with the annalist, that the letter has been forged by the Arians. All I think can be inferred from thence is, that the letters, like most other pieces there, have been misplaced; and that the above-mentioned words of Hilarius ought to be put after the letter of the council to Constantius, and not after that of Liberius to the Arians.

<sup>1</sup> Ath. ad Solit. p. 829; Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159; Hil. frag. 2, p. 41, 47.

<sup>2</sup> For Liberius, ashamed of what he had done against Athanasius, not only readmitted him soon after to his own communion, but with great zeal undertook his defence.

<sup>3</sup> Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 42; Ath. ap. 1, p. 691; Theod. l. 2, c. 17.



The glorious behavior of Paulinus. Liberius writes to the emperor for another council ; which is granted, and assembles at Milan. Some bishops banished.

They were the more inexcusable, as they had before their eyes the example of a great prelate, whose constancy was proof against all the threats and menaces of a provoked prince. This was the celebrated Paulinus bishop of Treves, who, after perusing the formulary drawn up by the Eusebians, to be signed by him and the other bishops, rejected it with the utmost indignation, declaring that nothing they could do should ever induce him to betray the truth, and his own conscience, by setting his hand to such a scandalous piece. The Eusebians left no art unattempted to gain him, as they had done the pope's legates ; but finding he was a man of a quite different disposition, and despairing of being ever able to prevail upon him either by hopes or fear, they at last had recourse to the emperor, who, putting his decree in execution, sent him into exile ; and in order to tire out his patience, ordered him to be constantly conveyed from one inhospitable place to another. But in every place Paulinus was the same, the conscience of his suffering for the sake of justice enabling him to bear, not only with patience, but cheerfulness, the inexpressible hardships he underwent.<sup>1</sup> He died in Phrygia in the fifth year of his exile,<sup>2</sup> that is, in 358. But his body is supposed to have been discovered in a church of his name at Treves, in the year 1071.<sup>3</sup> How and when it was conveyed thither, let those inquire who adore it.

To return to Liberius, he was so sensibly affected with the fall of Vincentius and his colleagues, that he wished for an opportunity of losing his life in so good a cause, and washing out with his blood the stain which the scandalous conduct of his legates had brought upon his character.<sup>4</sup> Thus he expresses himself in the letter which he wrote on that occasion to the great friend of his see, Osius.<sup>5</sup> However, in the height of his affliction, he found great relief in the courage and steadiness of Cæcilianus bishop of Spoleto, of Eusebius bishop of Vercelli, and of Lucifer bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia. The latter advised the pope to demand of the emperor another council, and generously took upon himself to go to Arles, where Constantius then was, and make that demand. Liberius readily accepted his offer, and named Pancratius and Hilarius for his colleagues, the one a presbyter, the other a deacon of the Church of Rome. By these he wrote an excellent letter to the emperor, wherein, with the liberty that became a Catholic bishop, but at the same time with all the respect that is due from a subject to his sovereign, he justifies his conduct in the defence of Athanasius, lays open the arts and views of the adverse party, and begs that a new council might be assembled,

there being no other means to put a stop to so many evils, and restore peace and tranquillity to the Catholic church.<sup>1</sup> At the same time Liberius wrote to Eusebius bishop of Vercelli, and Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia, entreating them to assist his legates with their advice, and even with their presence, should it be thought necessary. The three legates, on their arrival at Vercelli, in their way to Arles, were not only kindly received, but joined by Eusebius, who repaired with them to the emperor. As the Arians were noways averse to the proposal, nay, had even solicited the emperor to convene a new council, the request of the legates met with no difficulty ; so that a council was appointed to meet at Milan, where it met accordingly in the beginning of the year 355.<sup>2</sup> We are told, that it consisted of three hundred western bishops, and that from the east there came but very few.<sup>3</sup> But Constantius and his army may be said to have supplied their room. For the council no sooner met, than the emperor absolutely insisted upon their signing the condemnation of Athanasius, and an edict, containing the chief tenets of Arius, which had been published in his name. But in this attempt he met with a vigorous opposition from Dionysius bishop of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and the two other legates, Pancratius and Hilarius ; which provoked him to such a degree, that he was upon the point of commanding them to be executed upon the spot as rebels. But, upon second thoughts, he contented himself with sending them into exile, Dionysius into Capadocia, or Armenia, where he died a few years after, Eusebius to Scythopolis in Palæstine, and Lucifer to Germanicia in Syria. To what place Pancratius and Hilarius were confined, we know not ; but the latter was most cruelly whipped before he was banished.<sup>4</sup> As for the other bishops, I shall only say, with Ruffinus,<sup>5</sup> that, out of three hundred, Dionysius, Lucifer, and Eusebius, alone showed a firmness and intrepidity becoming men of their rank and dignity. Among the rest Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia signed the condemnation of Athanasius ; which greatly added to the grief and concern of Liberius, who, till that time, had entertained the highest opinion of him.

And now Constantius had the satisfaction of seeing Athanasius condemned by the far greater part of the western bishops. But the Bishop of Rome still declared openly in his favor, and did all that lay in his power to gain others to his party. To deprive him therefore of so powerful a protector, the emperor resolved to spare no cost nor labor. With this view he despatched to Rome the

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. l. 1, p. 6 ; et in Cons. l. 2, p. 119 ; Sulp. Sever. p. 157 ; Ath. in Ar. or. 1, p. 291, ad Solit. p. 831, de fug. 703.

<sup>2</sup> Sulp. Sever. p. 469 ; Hier. chron.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. in marty. 31 Aug.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Hil. frag. 47.

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. p. 39, 43.

<sup>2</sup> Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 159 ; Hil. frag. 2, p. 43 ; Athan. ad Solit. p. 846.

<sup>3</sup> Soz. p. 546, 547 ; Socr. l. 2, c. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 838.

<sup>5</sup> Ruff. l. 1, c. 20.



Constantius endeavors in vain to gain Liberius; who is sent prisoner to Milan. His interview with the emperor. His steadiness. He is banished to Berœa in Thrace. Felix is chosen in his room.

eunuch Eusebius, his great chamberlain, with rich presents in one hand, and a threatening letter in the other: but with an invincible firmness Liberius withstood both; so that the eunuch, who was himself a sworn enemy to Athanasius, returned to court baffled and disappointed; and there, by the account he gave of his unsuccessful embassy, added new fuel to the fire, which burnt already with great violence. The emperor, who pretended to govern the church no less despotically than he did the state, transported with rage at the stout opposition he met with from the Bishop of Rome, immediately despatched an order to Leoncius, prefect of that city, enjoining him to apprehend Liberius, and send him under a strong guard to court. Pursuant to this order, Liberius was seized in the night-time, lest the people, by whom he was greatly beloved, should attempt his rescue, and conveyed to Milan, where the court then resided.<sup>1</sup> Soon after his arrival he was brought before the emperor, when, undaunted and unawed by the presence of so great a prince, he spoke with all the liberty of an apostle, and with all the eloquence of a great orator.<sup>2</sup> At this interview were present Eusebius the eunuch, and Epictetus bishop of Centumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, who, for his ready compliance with the emperor's will, had been raised by him to great preferments.<sup>3</sup> The latter told Liberius, when he had ended the excellent speech he made before the emperor, that he had indeed expressed great zeal for the purity of the faith, and the liberty of councils; but the whole was mere mummery; and that he only wanted to be looked upon by his party as a person of some significancy, and to brag among the senators, on his return to Rome, that he had had the honor to dispute with the emperor.<sup>4</sup> The eunuch too thought he must speak, but it was only to betray his ignorance; for he reproached Liberius with defending Athanasius, who had been condemned, he said, as an heretic, by the council of Nice.<sup>5</sup> As for Constantius, the only reply he made to the reasons alleged by Liberius in favor of Athanasius, and the faith of Nice, was, that the wicked and impious Athanasius, as he styled him, had been condemned by the whole world; that, by his arrogant conduct, he had provoked all mankind, and himself in particular, by constantly stirring up his brother against him; that therefore he looked upon the defeat of Magnentius and Sylvanus, who had attempted to bereave him of his crown, as less important to him than the deposing and condemning of a man, by whom he had been so highly injured.<sup>6</sup> In answer to this, Liberius begged, that, of all men, he would not choose bishops for the instruments of his private revenge. Constan-

tius made no reply, but only told him, that he must either sign the condemnation of Athanasius, or be sent into exile; and that he allowed him three days to deliberate which of the two he would choose. Liberius answered, with great intrepidity, that he had already chosen, and was resolved; that in three days he should not change his resolution; and therefore the emperor might send him that minute to what place soever he pleased.<sup>1</sup> The three days were not yet expired when the emperor sent for him anew to court, hoping the fear of banishment had softened him, as it had done most others, into a compliance. But he found him unalterably fixed in the same resolution; and, therefore, despairing of being ever able to succeed in his attempts, he ordered him to be conveyed forthwith to Berœa in Thrace.<sup>2</sup> Liberius had not yet left the palace, when the emperor sent him a present of five hundred pieces of gold to defray his charges; which he sent back by the same person who brought them, saying, that the emperor might want money to pay his troops. The like sum was sent him by the Empress Eusebia; which, with the same answer, he desired might be conveyed to the emperor, adding, that if he knew not how to employ that sum better, he might bestow it on Epictetus, or Auxentius the Arian bishop of Milan, who would be very thankful for it.<sup>3</sup> He left Milan three days after, and set out for the place of his exile. His fate was no sooner known at Rome, than the clergy, assembling the people, bound themselves by a solemn oath, in their presence, not to acknowledge any other for their bishop so long as Liberius lived.<sup>4</sup>

Liberius being thus driven from his see, another was placed on it in his room; and the person, whom the emperor and the Arian faction pitched upon, was one Felix, then only deacon of the Church of Rome.<sup>5</sup> But the clergy could not proceed to a new election, without an open violation of the oath they had taken; the people began to mutiny, and, assembling in crowds, would suffer none of the Arian faction to enter their churches. The imperial palace therefore served instead of a church; three of the emperor's eunuchs represented the people; and three bishops, slaves of the court, namely, Epictetus of Centumcellæ, Acacius of Cæsarea, and Basilus of Ancyra, ordained the new elected bishop.<sup>6</sup> Thus was Felix chosen, and thus ordained. As Liberius was greatly beloved by the people, chiefly on account of his vigorous opposition to Constantius, the intrusion of Felix occasioned a great sedition, in which many lost their lives.<sup>7</sup> The clergy

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 834, 835; Ammian. l. 15, p. 47; Theod. l. 2, c. 13, et l. 15, p. 38, 41, 47.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. et Theod. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. in Ar. or. 1, p. 290; Marcell. et Faustin. lib. prec. ad Theod. p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 13.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. et Athan. ad Solit. p. 835.

<sup>3</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 13; Soz. l. 4, c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Marc. et Faust. &c. p. 3; Hier. chron.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 861; Ruff. l. 1, c. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Athan. ib. Hier. ep. 98; Soz. l. 4, c. 24; Socr. l. 2, c. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 15.



Constantius goes to Rome. The Roman ladies intercede for Liberius. The emperor promises to recall him. The edict, recalling him to govern jointly with Felix, rallied by the Roman people.

were not so zealous in the cause as the people; for great numbers of them, unmindful of the oath they had taken, were by degrees reconciled to Felix, and communicated with him;<sup>1</sup> whereas the people continued to abhor and avoid him at least till the year 357, when Constantius came to Rome.<sup>2</sup> For that prince, being desirous to see the metropolis of his empire, undertook a journey to Rome in the above-mentioned year, and entered it in triumph on the 28th of April.<sup>3</sup> During his short stay in that city, the Roman ladies gave a signal instance of the zeal and affection they still retained for their exiled bishop. They thought a more favorable opportunity could never offer to solicit the emperor for his return; and therefore, by a private agreement among themselves, they pressed their husbands, with great earnestness, to lay hold of it, threatening to abandon them if they did not, and repairing to their bishop to share with him the hardships of his exile. The husbands, unmoved by such menaces, which they well knew would never take place, answered, that by such an application they might incur the displeasure of the prince, which would prove fatal to them, as well as to the person in whose behalf they interposed; whereas, should they themselves take such a pious and commendable office upon them, the respect due to their sex would, in all likelihood, extort from the prince the desired favor, at least it would restrain his resentment, and stifle all thoughts of revenge. The proposal was universally applauded by the ladies, unwilling to expose their husbands to the dire effects of the emperor's indignation. On an appointed day, therefore, attiring themselves in an apparel suitable to their rank, that the emperor in seeing them might know who they were, and treat them accordingly, they repaired to court; and being immediately admitted to the prince's presence, they conjured him, with tears in their eyes, to take pity of that great city, of that numerous flock, bereft of its pastor, and, in his absence, devoured by ravenous wolves. This was not at all a courtly language: however, Constantius, without betraying the least emotion, said, "I thought you had a pastor. Is not Felix as capable of discharging the pastoral office as any other?" "Felix," replied they, "is detested, and avoided by all." At these words the emperor first looked grave; but, immediately changing his gravity into a smile, "If so," said he, with great complaisance, "you must have Liberius again: I shall, without delay, despatch the proper orders for his return." An edict was accordingly issued the very next day, recalling Liberius to govern the church jointly with Felix; for Constantius thought it inconsistent with his honor, and the impe-

rial dignity, to drive Felix from the see, on which he himself had placed him.

When this edict was read, in the presence of the emperor, to the people assembled in the Circus, they applauded it at first, by way of raillery, saying, "That since the spectators, at the public sports, were divided into two parties, it was just and reasonable there should be two bishops to head them." The multitude, not satisfied with thus pleasantly expressing their dissatisfaction, cried out, immediately after, with one voice, "There is but one God, one Christ, one Bishop."<sup>1</sup> And yet the emperor was rather delighted than displeased with the humor of the people, and the liberty they took; for to what happened on this occasion Ammianus Marcellinus probably alludes, where he writes, that Constantius, in exhibiting public sports at Rome, was pleased with the liberty they took to rally him, knowing it did not proceed from pride or ill-nature.<sup>2</sup> Theodoret tells us, that to acclamations so worthy of the Roman piety, the emperor granted the return of Liberius;<sup>3</sup> and with him agree Sulpitius Severus,<sup>4</sup> and Ruffinus.<sup>5</sup> But Sozomen,<sup>6</sup> and all the writers of those times, assure us, that his return did not happen this, but the following year, 358, when he bought it dear, by signing the condemnation of Athanasius, and the symbol or creed, composed by the Semi-Arians at Sirmium, now Sirmish in Sclavonia. Constantius, at the request of the Roman ladies and people, promised to recall him, as I have related; but it was on condition, says Sozomen,<sup>7</sup> that he should agree with the bishops of the court, that is, with the Semi-Arians. The firmness which Liberius had hitherto shown, left no room to doubt of his rejecting such a proposal with the greatest indignation. But he now felt what before he had only beheld at a distance: he began to compare the ease and plenty in which he had lived at Rome, with the inconveniences and hardships of his present exile. Besides, from the menaces thrown out against him by the emperor's officers, he apprehended his life to be in danger.<sup>8</sup> 'Tis true, he had wished for an opportunity of shedding his blood in so good a cause, as I have related above. But who is not brave at a distance from danger? The jealousy he had of Felix, who, sitting in his chair, acted the high-pontiff at Rome, was the Delila, says Baronius,<sup>9</sup> speaking of his signing the condemnation of Athanasius, who bereft this Samson of all his strength and courage. However that be, it is certain that the strength and courage, which he had with great glory exerted on other occasions, vanished at once. For he not only signed the condemnation of Athanasius, but moreover

<sup>1</sup> Hier. chron. Marc. et Faust. p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 861; Theod. l. 2, c. 14; Ammian. l. 16, p. 72.

<sup>3</sup> Ammian. l. 16, p. 69, 72; Idat. chron. Alex.

<sup>4</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 14; Soz. l. 4, c. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Amm. l. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Sulp. Sever. l. 2, p. 160.

<sup>7</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 837.

<sup>9</sup> Theod. ib.

<sup>10</sup> Ruff. l. 1, c. 27.

<sup>11</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>12</sup> Bar. ad ann. 357, n. 41.



Liberius signs the condemnation of Athanasius, and embraces the doctrine of Sirmium. His letter to the eastern bishops. He is anathematized by Hilarius. His letter to the bishops. He is recalled from his banishment.

approved and received, as catholic, the confession or symbol of Sirmium.<sup>1</sup> Thus, to ingratiate himself with the emperor, and return to Rome, did Liberius abandon, at last, his persecuted friend, renounce the Catholic faith, and solemnly promise to maintain inviolable the doctrine of Sirmium.<sup>2</sup> As he was impatient to be reinstated in his see, he took care immediately to acquaint the emperor with the steps he had taken. With this letter he despatched Fortunatianus bishop of Aquileia, charging him to solicit Constantius for his return, since he had done all he had required of him.<sup>3</sup> Constantius took no notice of, nor returned any answer to, this letter. On the other hand, Liberius was heartily sick of his exile, heartily sick of suffering for the sake of justice. In hopes therefore of putting a speedy end to his exile, and the hardships attending it, he wrote in a most submissive and cringing style to the eastern bishops, assuring them, that it was merely out of respect to his predecessor Julius, and to maintain his judgment, that he had undertaken the defence of Athanasius; that as soon as it had pleased God to open his eyes, and discover to him how justly he had been condemned, he had separated himself from his communion, and joined them; that all their decrees concerning him should be inviolably observed by the apostolic see, as indeed they ought to be; that he sincerely and willingly received the true catholic and orthodox faith, as it had been expounded and defined by several of his brethren and colleagues at Sirmium, and had been proposed to him by his colleague Demophilus; that he received every article of that symbol, and had nothing to object against any. This remarkable letter he concludes thus: "And now that I agree with you in every point, let me earnestly entreat your holinesses to employ your joint interest in my behalf, that I may be recalled from banishment, and suffered to return to the see which God has been pleased to commit to my care."<sup>4</sup> This letter has been conveyed to us by the great Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers, who, in relating it, not able to restrain the just indignation it kindled in his breast, interrupts the recital three times, to anathematize the author of it, the *prevaricating* Liberius, as he styles him.<sup>5</sup> He wrote likewise to Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, who bore great sway at court, and were at the head of the Arian faction in the west, to acquaint them that he communicated with them, and also with Auxentius and Epictetus, two of the most inveterate enemies the orthodox had; and that whoever did not communicate with them, that is, every catholic bishop, was cut off from his communion. These words Hilarius cannot repeat without anathematizing anew Liberius, and all the Arians with him. In the same letter he lets

them know, that he has separated himself from the communion of Athanasius, late bishop of Alexandria, acknowledging him, by that expression, lawfully deposed. He declares, in the beginning of his letter, and calls God to witness, that it is not by compulsion, but merely for the sake of peace and charity, far preferable to martyrdom itself, that he writes to them. He conjures them, by the omnipotent God, by his Son Jesus, by the Holy Ghost, to intercede for him with the emperor, that, by his return, peace and tranquillity may be restored to the church committed to his care; assuring them, that the zeal they exert in so pious, so just a cause, will meet with a proportionable reward in heaven.<sup>1</sup>

As the emperor had not yet taken the least notice of his letter; as the eastern bishops, as well as the bishops at court, did not act, as he thought, with all the zeal and expedition he expected, and his ready compliance well deserved; he wrote a third letter, directed to Vincentius, Bishop of Capua, acquainting him that he had abandoned the defence of Athanasius, and desiring him to give notice thereof to all the bishops of Campania; and, at the same time, to use his utmost endeavors to persuade them to despatch some of their body with a letter, in their common name, to the emperor, begging Constantius to deliver him, without further delay, from his present most melancholy and deplorable situation. To this letter he adds the following paragraph, in his own hand: "We live in peace with all the bishops of the east, and with you. As for me, I have discharged my conscience before God. Will you suffer me to perish in my present exile? The same God will judge us both."<sup>2</sup> The Bishop of Capua had been formerly sent by Liberius to the council of Arles, with the character of his legate, as I have observed above, and had there signed the condemnation of Athanasius; on which occasion Liberius wished for an opportunity of washing out, with his own blood, the stain which the conduct of his legate had brought upon his character. But his only wish now was to see himself delivered from his painful exile, and restored to his former state, upon any terms. Vincentius, touched with his complaints, prevailed upon the bishops of Campania to send a solemn deputation to the emperor in his behalf; which Constantius complied with, so far as to recall him from the place of his exile to Sirmium, where the court then was.<sup>3</sup> Upon his arrival there, Constantius, who had lately embraced the doctrine of the Semi-Arians, taking advantage of his weakness, and of the eager desire he had betrayed of returning to his see, obliged him, as well as the bishops of the court, and four African bishops, who happened to be then at Sirmium, to sign the same doctrine.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 48; Hier. vir. il. c. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib. p. 47, 48.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.











Liberius signs the doctrine of the Semi-Arians. What alleged by Baronius in his defence; and by Bellarmine. Liberius returns to Rome.

Thus did the infallible Liberius sign, and embrace, at least in appearance, both the Arian and Semi-Arian heresy; the Arian at Berœa, the place of his exile, and the Semi-Arian at Sirmium. That the confession he signed at Berœa was Arian, cannot be doubted; for it was the second of Sirmium, which all agree to have been Arian.<sup>1</sup> Besides, it was proposed to him by Demophilus bishop of Berœa, who was a most zealous stickler for Arianism, and greatly attached to Ursacius and Valens, the two leading men among the Arians in the west; and it is not at all probable, that he would have required Liberius to sign a doctrine different from that which he himself held.

The advocates for the pope's infallibility are here quite at a loss what to say in defence of that prerogative. That Liberius signed the condemnation of Athanasius, that he communicated with the Arians, and, what above all galls them, that he received the Sirmian confession of faith as catholic and orthodox, are undeniable matters of fact. To reconcile them with infallibility, is what they have been long drudging at: and to what pitiful shifts, what eluding and unmeaning distinctions, have they not been obliged to recur! Like a man struggling for life in deep water, and catching at every twig to save it, they flounce from quibble to quibble, from one subterfuge to another, but all in vain; sink they must, and their infallibility with them. To show their distress, I shall briefly transcribe what I find offered on this occasion, by the most learned among them, in defence of the cause they have undertaken. Baronius,<sup>2</sup> after relating and owning the above-mentioned facts, addresses his readers thus: "We have hitherto sailed among dangerous rocks, among treacherous shoals; but fear not, I shall at

last pilot you safe into the port of truth." Then, dropping his allegory, he makes a long descant to prove, that the Sirmian Confession of Faith, signed by Liberius, was, in every article, catholic and orthodox. A rare pilot indeed! If this (to pursue his allegory) is "the port of truth," who can help pitying Jerom, Hilarius, Athanasius, and in short all the ancients? for they certainly missed it, and, falling in among those "dangerous rocks, those treacherous shoals," which Baronius had the skill and good luck to avoid, were there unfortunately shipwrecked. For Jerom says, in express terms, and in two places,<sup>1</sup> that Liberius signed an heresy; Hilarius, that he approved of the Arian perfidy;<sup>2</sup> Athanasius, that he joined the Arians;<sup>3</sup> and all the ancients, that he apostatized from the faith: nay, Liberius himself, in his letter to the orientals, which is still to be seen, under his own hand, in the Vatican library, gives them notice, that "in all things" he agrees with Demophilus, a most zealous Arian, and with them; which words Hilarius could not repeat without anathematizing him. It is therefore manifest, beyond all dispute, that the confession of faith, signed by Liberius, was not catholic, but Arian. Of this Baronius himself was, without doubt, well apprized, and into this port he had piloted his reader, had truth alone been his land-mark. Bellarmine, the other great stickler for infallibility, pursues a different method, but with worse success, in my opinion, than his fellow-champion, Baronius; for, by striving to support that chimerical prerogative, he evidently oversets it. The pope, according to him, may sign and receive heretical opinions, as Liberius did, without prejudicing in the least his infallibility, provided he does not internally assent to them;<sup>4</sup> so that the so much boasted infallibility is by him reduced at last to this: that the pope cannot internally assent to an error; which is confining his infallibility to himself, and consequently disqualifying him for the office of a teacher. Infallibility, even thus curtailed, is, no doubt, a most valuable treasure to the owner, but of no more use to the rest of mankind than a treasure concealed under ground; and, on that very account, it ought in common sense to be exploded. But it is scarce worth the while to quarrel with Bellarmine about it, since he cannot be so unreasonable as to require us, in virtue of such a prerogative, to pay any regard to the decisions of the pope, till such time, at least, as we know them to be agreeable to his private opinion: and this is what we can never know, since every pope may, like Liberius, externally admit an opinion as true; and, at the same time, internally reject it as false.

But, to return to Liberius; he was at last, in regard of his ready compliance with the

<sup>1</sup> Three councils were held at Sirmium, one in 349, another in 352, and the third in 357. In the first, Photinus, bishop of that city, was condemned, for reviving the heresy of Paul of Samosata. This council was entirely composed of the western bishops, who attempted to depose Photinus, but were vigorously opposed by the people. The second council of Sirmium was convened by the Emperor Constantius, and consisted of the eastern bishops only, who condemned anew, and deposed Photinus. By this council a symbol or creed was composed, which has been transmitted to us in Greek by St. Athanasius, and in Latin by St. Hilarius; and is entirely orthodox. In the third council of Sirmium a new creed was composed by Potamius bishop of Lisbon, and signed by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and the other bishops there present. This creed was altogether Arian; for not only the word "consubstantial" was rejected by it, but the Son was declared to be unlike the Father in essence, to be less than the Father, and to have had a beginning. And it was this second symbol of Sirmium that Liberius signed at Berœa. Upon his arrival at Sirmium he found there Basilus of Ancyra, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and the other Semi-Arian bishops, who were lately come from the council of Ancyra, where they had condemned the doctrine of the pure Arians, and established that of the Semi-Arians, holding the Son to be like the Father in nature and essence, but not "consubstantial," or of the same substance. And this doctrine Liberius signed out of complaisance to the emperor, that nothing might obstruct his return to Rome. He signed it in a kind of council, consisting of the Semi-Arian bishops whom I have mentioned above.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad. ann. 357, n. 46.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 97, et in chron.

<sup>2</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ad Solit.

<sup>4</sup> Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4, c. 9.



Felix is driven out. The judgment of the ancients concerning Felix. He is honored by the Church of Rome as a saint and a Martyr. His fabulous Acts. How he came to be honored as a saint.

will of the emperor, allowed to return to Rome; but on condition that he should govern jointly with Felix.<sup>1</sup> Letters were accordingly despatched both to Felix and the Roman clergy, to acquaint them therewith. Sozomen seems to insinuate that they both governed thus for some time.<sup>2</sup> But, according to St. Jerom, and the two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who lived then at Rome, and were eye-witnesses of what they relate, Felix was driven not only from the see, but out of the city, as soon as Liberius entered it; which he did on the 2d of August, 358, in in a kind of triumph, being met and received by the whole people with loud acclamations of joy.<sup>3</sup> Felix returned soon after, at the instigation of a few of the ecclesiastics, who had, contrary to their oath, adhered to him; and even attempted to perform divine service in the basilic of Julius, beyond the Tiber; but the enraged multitude drove him out a second time, and, with him, all the ecclesiastics who had acknowledged him.<sup>4</sup> Socrates writes, that the emperor himself was in the end obliged to give him up, and consent to his expulsion.<sup>5</sup> Mention is made in the pontificals of a bloody persecution, raised in Rome by Liberius and his party against the partisans of Felix, who, it is said, were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the baths, in all public places, and even in the churches.<sup>6</sup> But as none of the ancients take the least notice of such cruelties, I will not charge Liberius with them, upon the bare authority of such records. Felix, being driven from Rome, withdrew to a small estate he had on the road to Porto, and there spent the remaining part of his life in retirement.<sup>7</sup> Sozomen supposes him to have died soon after.<sup>8</sup> But the two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who must have been better informed, assure us, that he lived seven years after the return of Liberius, and died on the 22d of November, 365.<sup>9</sup>

Concerning Felix, all the ancients agree that he was unlawfully elected and ordained; that he communicated with the Arians; that, to ingratiate himself with them and the emperor, he signed the condemnation of Athanasius; that he was guilty of perjury in accepting the episcopal dignity, having bound himself, with the rest of the clergy, by a solemn oath, to acknowledge no other bishop while Liberius lived; and, lastly, that he strove to keep possession of the Roman see, after the return of the lawful bishop, and to sit in it, together with him, in open defiance of the canons of the church. Socrates adds, that he not only communicated with the Arians, but was infected with the Arian heresy.<sup>10</sup> Athanasius styles him "a monster raised to the see of

Rome by the malice of antichrist, one worthy of those who raised him, and in every respect well qualified for the execution of their wicked designs."<sup>1</sup> And yet this heretic, this monster, this intruder, or anti-pope, is honored (the reader will be surprised to hear it, is honored) by the church of Rome as a saint; nay, as a martyr; and his festival is kept to this day, on the 29th of July. This honor was conferred on him in the ages of darkness and ignorance, upon the authority of his fabulous Acts, and a more fabulous pontifical, from which his Acts seem to have been copied. In the pontifical it is said, that Felix declared Constantius, who had been twice baptized, an heretic; and was therefore, by an order from the incensed emperor, apprehended, and privately beheaded, with many ecclesiastics and laymen, under the walls of Rome, on the 11th of November. It is added, that the presbyter Damasus privately conveyed his body to a church, which Felix had built, and there interred it; and that, upon his death, the see remained vacant for the space of thirty-eight days.<sup>2</sup> In the Acts of Felix we read, that Constantius was rebaptized by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia; that Felix having, on that account, declared him an heretic, he was driven from the see of Rome, and Liberius replaced on it; that Felix thereupon retired into the country, but was brought back by the emperor's orders, and beheaded on the 10th of November; that his body was interred on the 20th of the same month in a church, which he had built while he was a presbyter: And we keep his festival, adds the author, on the 29th of July.<sup>3</sup> Anastasius has copied the pontifical, word for word, except that he pretends Felix to have been beheaded at Cora, in the Campagna of Rome;<sup>4</sup> though he has told us, in the foregoing page, that he "died in peace," a phrase never used in speaking of martyrs, on the 29th of July, at his estate on the road to Porto.<sup>5</sup> The city of Cere, now Cerventera, in Tuscany, honors Felix to this day, as their chief patron or protector. In those dark times legends alone were in request, and all other books, even the Scripture itself, quite out of date and neglected. No wonder therefore that such absurdities, however inconsistent with history, were swallowed without straining; and Felix, for his pretended zeal and constancy, ranked among the holy martyrs. For I may venture to affirm, that the most learned men, at that time, in the church, knew nothing of Felix but what they had learned from his fabulous Acts, and from the above-mentioned pontifical. That I may not be thought to exaggerate, I shall allege one instance of the ignorance of past times: Gulielmus a Sancto Amore, one of the most learned men of the 13th century, knew that, in the time of Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers, a

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. chron. Mar. et Faust. p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 37.

<sup>6</sup> Anast. c. 37; Boll. Apr. t. 1, p. 31.

<sup>7</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 13; Philg. l. 4, c. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Marc. et Faust. p. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Socrat. l. 2, c. 37.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 861.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 1, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> MS. p. 219.

<sup>4</sup> Anast. c. 37, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib. p. 21.



Felix's sanctity called in question; and his cause re-examined. His sanctity and martyrdom confirmed by the discovery of his body. His legend proved to be fabulous.

pope, with most of the bishops, had fallen into heresy. He did not even pretend to be so well versed in history as to know for certain who the pope was; but, indulging a conjecture, which he thought probable enough, he named Anastasius II., who died in 498, about one hundred and fifty years after the time of Hilarius; so that he was an utter stranger to the history of Pope Liberius, and consequently to that of the antipope Felix. Had it not been for the like ignorance in more early times, the apotheosis of our pretended martyr had never taken place. Be that as it will, during the ages of darkness he held undisturbed the rank to which he had been thus raised: but when the dawn of knowledge began to appear, and it was discovered at last from contemporary and unexceptionable writers, who Felix was, the church of Rome was ashamed to own him among her saints. On the other hand, to degrade him had been giving a fatal blow to the pope's authority, and rendering it for ever precarious, in so material a point as that of canonization. Felix therefore was, at all events, to keep his place in heaven; his sanctity was to be confirmed, and the world imposed upon by some contrivance or other, capable of utterly defeating the testimony of the ancients.

This point being settled, to prevent all suspicion of deceit, or underhand dealings, Pope Gregory XIII. declared, in 1582, his intention of having the cause of Felix impartially examined. In order to this, he appointed Baronius, employed at that time in reforming the Roman martyrology, to put in writing whatever could be objected against Felix, and Cardinal Santorio to answer his objections, and collect likewise in writing all that could be said in favor of his new client, that the pope might be thoroughly acquainted with the merits of the cause before he came to a final decision. This conduct in Gregory has been censured by some over-zealous divines of the Church of Rome, as if he had thereby given the world occasion to think that he questioned the infallibility of his predecessors, who had honored Felix as a saint.<sup>1</sup> But Gregory well knew what he was doing, and how the whole would end. In compliance with his orders, Baronius wrote a dissertation, which he himself calls a volume, and not a short one,<sup>2</sup> to prove that Felix was neither a saint nor a martyr. As he had truth on his side, Cardinal Santorio, though a man of learning, could neither answer his arguments, nor offer any thing in so desperate a cause worthy of himself. He often addressed himself in his prayers to his client, entreating him to undertake his own cause, by suggesting to him what might be alleged in his defence. But the client was no less at a stand than the advocate. Some other person,

therefore, must interpose: and whom did the carrying or losing such a cause more nearly concern than the pope, since his authority in a most essential point was at stake? This was a nice affair, and to be managed with great art and dexterity. Gregory, therefore, having often heard both sides, in a full congregation of cardinals, without betraying the least partiality for Felix, appointed them to meet for the last time on the 28th of July, the eve of the pretended saint's festival, judging that the most proper time to play off with good success the trick, which he had kept the whole time *in petto*. The cardinals met on the day appointed; Baronius quite silenced his adversary; the whole assembly was fully convinced that Felix was no saint, no martyr; the pope himself seemed to fall in with the rest, and accordingly rose up to declare, as was thought, the unhappy Felix fallen from heaven; when a great noise was all on a sudden heard at the door, and immediately a messenger entered, who, after uttering these words, "holy Felix, pray for us," acquainted the pope and the cardinals that the body of Felix was just discovered. Hereupon they all repaired in great haste to the church of Cosmas and Damianus, where the miraculous discovery had been made; and there saw, in a marble coffin of an extraordinary size, on one side the bodies of Mark, Marcellianus, and Tranquillinus; and on the other that of Felix, with this inscription on a stone that lay by it, "The body of Saint Felix, who condemned Constantius."<sup>1</sup> Hereupon the Te Deum was sung with great solemnity for the triumph of truth: Felix was declared worthy of the veneration and worship that had till then been paid him, and a place was allowed him among the other saints in the Roman martyrology, where it is said, that "he was driven from his see for defending the Catholic faith, by Constantius, an Arian emperor, and privately put to death at Cere, now Cervetera, in Tuscany." Baronius, transported with joy, as he himself declares,<sup>2</sup> at so miraculous and seasonable a discovery, immediately yielded, not to his antagonist Santorio, but to Felix, who had evidently interposed; and, taking that interposition for a satisfactory answer to all his arguments, he immediately retracted whatever he had said, and consigned to the flames whatever he had written in opposition to Felix.<sup>3</sup> Thus, to maintain a chimerical prerogative, they sport with truth; betray into error those who confide in them; and, turning the worst of men into saints, honor vice with the greatest reward they can bestow on virtue.

That this pretended discovery was nothing but a contrivance to confirm the martyrdom of Felix, and impose upon the world, is manifest; and that the pontifical, and his acts, on

<sup>1</sup> Leuchesini de infall. sed. Rom. p. 97; Rossi vicario di Cristo, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 557, n. 63.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 557, n. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. n. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.



Felix did not excommunicate Constantius. Whether a lawful pope or an antipope. Felix an antipope.

which his martyrdom was originally founded, were a no less palpable and gross imposition, may be easily demonstrated. For, in the first place, Marcellinus and Faustinus, who lived in the time of Felix and Liberius at Rome, tell us, in express terms, that Felix, "who had been substituted to Liberius, died on the 22d of November, 365,"<sup>1</sup> that is, four years after the death of Constantius, by whom he is said, in his Acts, and in the pontifical, to have been martyred. Athanasius assures us,<sup>2</sup> and with him agree Philostorgius,<sup>3</sup> and the Chronicle of Alexandria,<sup>4</sup> that Constantius was not baptized till at the point of death, when he received that sacrament at the hands of Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch. And yet both the Acts of Felix and the pontifical will have him to have been twice baptized before his death; for it was on this account that Felix is said to have declared him a heretic. This declaration Baronius improves into a solemn excommunication; and, being become, after the above-mentioned discovery, a most zealous advocate for Felix, tells us, that the holy martyr was no sooner placed on the throne of St. Peter, than, changing his conduct, he separated himself from the communion of those by whom he had been raised, and boldly thundered an anathema against the emperor himself.<sup>5</sup> What a pity that Athanasius was not better acquainted with the conduct of Felix! for if he had, he would never have styled him "a monster placed on the see of Rome by the malice of antichrist." Such an attempt, unheard of till that time, must have made a great noise; and yet I find it was heard by none but Baronius, who lived at so great a distance. I may add, that there was no room for an excommunication against Constantius, who was still a catechumen, and consequently did not partake of the sacred mysteries.

The Roman Catholic writers, to save the credit of Felix, maintained him to have been, at least for some time, lawful pope. But, to confute whatever has been or can be said by them in his favor, without entering into a detail of the many sophistical and unconvincing arguments, false assertions, and groundless suppositions, with which they endeavor to disguise the truth, and confound their readers, I argue thus: that Liberius was lawfully chosen, and Felix unlawfully, is past all dispute. Now, upon the fall of Liberius, either there was, or there was not, a new election: if there was not, Liberius continued to be lawful bishop; or if by his fall he forfeited his dignity, as some think he did, the see became vacant; for nothing subsequent to the unlawful election of Felix could render it lawful. If there was a new election, and Felix was lawfully chosen, Liberius from that minute either ceased to be pope, or there were

two lawful popes at a time. The latter they will not admit, lest they should turn the church into a monster with two heads. They must therefore allow Felix to have been lawful pope, and Liberius an antipope, till the see became vacant by the death of the former. But, on the other hand, this new election is quite groundless, highly improbable, and absolutely repugnant to what we read in the ancient and contemporary writers. It is quite groundless; for though Bellarmine speaks of a new election with as much confidence as if he had been one of the electors,<sup>1</sup> yet we find not the least hint of it in any of the writers of those times, who would not have passed over in silence so remarkable an event, had it come to their knowledge. It is highly improbable; for Liberius was greatly beloved by the whole people, and the far greater part of the clergy; and Felix hated to such a degree, that of all the inhabitants of Rome, not one ever appeared in the church while he was in it;<sup>2</sup> nay, he was by all avoided, even in the streets and other public places, as if he had carried about with him a contagion.<sup>3</sup> Is it not therefore altogether improbable, that the people and clergy should depose the man, whom in a manner they adored, for communicating with the Arians, and appoint one in his room, who likewise communicated with them, and was universally detested, avoided, and abhorred? And yet all this is gravely supposed by Bellarmine.<sup>4</sup> Lastly, the election of Felix is repugnant to what we read in the ancient writers, who all speak of him as an antipope, and an intruder. Optatus, who lived at that very time, and St. Austin, who flourished soon after, have not allowed him a place in their catalogues of the bishops of Rome. Theodoret takes no notice of him in his catalogues of the bishops of the chief cities. St. Jerom and Prosper count Liberius the thirty-fourth bishop of Rome, and Damasus, who succeeded him, the thirty-fifth; a plain indication that they did not look upon Felix as lawful bishop. Among the moderns, Onuphrius Panvinus, in his *Lives of the Popes*, printed in 1557, some years before the discovery of Felix's body, calls Novatian the first antipope, and Felix the second. But his book was prohibited in 1583, the year after the second canonization of Felix. The writers, who came after, took warning; and such of them as thought it base to concur in deceiving mankind, since it was not safe to undeceive them, chose to waive this subject, but not without giving some broad hints of what they believed in their hearts. Thus F. Labbé,<sup>5</sup> and Cardinal Bona,<sup>6</sup> take no notice of this Felix, but call Pope Felix, who was raised to the see of Rome in 485, the second

<sup>1</sup> Marcell. et Faust. p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 907.

<sup>3</sup> Philost. l. 6, c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. Alex. p. 684.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 357, n. 65.

<sup>1</sup> Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4, c. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Theodoret, p. 610.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ad Solit. p. 861.

<sup>4</sup> Bell. *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Lab. chron.

<sup>6</sup> Bona, lit. l. 2, c. 11, p. 423.



Felix acknowledged as a Saint by some Roman Catholic writers. The emperor undertakes the establishing of Arianism. An account of the life of Osius. He is imprisoned under Maximian. He instructs Constantine.

pope of that name. Felix I. was martyred under Aurelian in 274, as we have related elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> F. Labbé, at the death of Felix II., which happened in 492, adds, that he was the third of that name, according to Baronius.<sup>2</sup> Had Felix never been canonized, no man would have been so regardless of his own reputation as to undertake his defence; but Gregory having declared him a saint, and, by such a declaration, linked his cause with infallibility in a most essential point, the hired champions of that see found themselves under an indispensable obligation of entering the lists; which I need not say they have done to no purpose.

The fall of the Bishop of Rome, who was at the head of the orthodox party, inspired the emperor with great hopes of succeeding in the design he had formed of utterly abolishing the orthodox faith: he found there were but few bishops whose virtue was proof against the frowns and resentment of the court. In the council held at Arles in 353, they had all to a man chosen rather to communicate with the Arians, than be driven from their sees: in that which was convened two years after, at Milan, only three bishops were found, namely, Dionysius bishop of that city, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Eusebius of Vercelli, who, equally unmoved by threats and promises, had maintained the truth with the loss of their dignity. The example of the Bishop of Rome had been followed by the far greater part of the bishops of Italy. But what above all encouraged the emperor to pursue the scheme he had so much at heart, was the fall of the celebrated Osius bishop of Cordoua, in the hundredth year of his age, and sixty-second of his episcopacy. As the name of Osius is one of the most famous in the ecclesiastical history of those times, and his fall is alleged by the ancients as a memorable instance of the weakness of human nature, however strengthened and improved by a long practice of the most eminent virtues, a succinct account of so remarkable an event will not, I hope, be unacceptable to the reader, or thought foreign to the subject in hand.

Osius was a native of Spain,<sup>3</sup> born, according to some, in Cordoua, about the year 256, and raised, in regard of his extraordinary merit, to the see of that city in 295.<sup>4</sup> He was even then conspicuous for the firmness of his faith, and the purity of his life, says Sozomen.<sup>5</sup> Athanasius, who was well acquainted with him, speaks of him with the greatest respect and esteem, calling him a man truly holy, according to the Greek signification of his name; one in whose conduct even his most inveterate enemies could discover nothing that was not commendable, his life being irreprehensible, and his reputation un-

spotted.<sup>1</sup> Theodoret,<sup>2</sup> and Eusebius,<sup>3</sup> extol him on account of his extraordinary prudence, wisdom, and learning, which gave great weight to his opinion in the many councils at which he assisted, and often presided. In the year 300, he was present at the council of Eliberis, or Illeberis, in Spain, famous for the severity of its canons; and, in all likelihood, made even then a considerable figure; since, in the Acts of that council, he is named in the second place after Felix of Acci, now Guadix, in Andalusia, who probably presided.<sup>4</sup> Three years after broke out the persecution of Maximian Hercules, in which Osius distinguished himself by his zeal, his constancy, and his sufferings; for, having with great intrepidity confessed his faith before the pagan magistrates, he was by them imprisoned, and kept under a very close and painful confinement for the space of two years, that is, from the year 303 to 305, when, upon the abdication of Maximian and Dioclesian, he was set at liberty by Constantius Chlorus, the father of Constantine the Great.<sup>5</sup> He is honored by Athanasius,<sup>6</sup> by the council of Sardica, and by most of the ancients, with the title of confessor, which was given to such as had suffered imprisonment, torments, or exile, but had not died, for the confession of the faith. He was highly esteemed and revered by Constantine, not only as a confessor, but as a person of extraordinary wisdom and probity;<sup>7</sup> whence he is thought to have been one of the prelates whom that prince consulted in 311,<sup>8</sup> and kept with him to instruct him in the mysteries of the Christian religion. Some think that Osius was meant by the Egyptian priest come from Spain, to whom Zosimus ascribes the change made by Constantine in point of religion.<sup>9</sup> The church of Cordoua was, out of regard to him, enriched by Constantine with many valuable presents, whence he is said to have been very rich.<sup>10</sup> But what use he made of his wealth we may learn from Athanasius, who assures us, that no one in want ever applied to him without being relieved, and receiving the supply he demanded.<sup>11</sup> In the famous dispute, which I have taken notice of in its proper place, between Cæcilianus and the Donatists of Africa, Osius undertook, with great zeal, the defence of the former, and prevailed in the end upon Constantine to espouse his cause, and declare against the Donatists,<sup>12</sup> whom he thenceforth punished with great severity, taking their churches from them, and sending the most obstinate among them into exile. Constantine being become master of

<sup>1</sup> Vide p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 838.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Lab. chron.

<sup>5</sup> Soz. l. 1. c. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 841.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2, c. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. tom. 1, p. 969.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 838; Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2, c. 63.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ib. apol. 2, p. 760, et alibi.

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. ib. Socr. l. 1, c. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Euseb. ib. l. 1, c. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Zos. l. 2, p. 435.

<sup>9</sup> Marc. et Faust. p. 34.

<sup>10</sup> Athan. de fug. p. 704.

<sup>11</sup> Aug. in Parm. l. 1, c. 8.



Osius sent to compose some disputes in the east. He assists at the council of Nice, and draws up the Nicene creed. Constantius attempts to gain him over to the Arian party. He is sent to Sirmium. Confined and racked.

the east in the year 323, his first care was to put an end to the unhappy divisions that reigned in those churches about the celebration of Easter, and some other controverted points. With this view he despatched Osius into the east, who, upon his arrival there, summoned a council to meet at Alexandria, which, under his influence, condemned the heresy of Sabellius, put a stop to the schism of one Colluthus, and greatly allayed the animosity of the contending parties about the day on which Easter was to be kept.<sup>1</sup> On his return to court, the account he gave of the Arians, whose heresy he had endeavored in vain to suppress, made so deep an impression in the mind of the emperor, that, for a long time, he continued highly prejudiced against them.<sup>2</sup> It was at the suggestion of Osius that Constantine assembled the council of Nice in 325, at which he assisted, and distinguished himself above the rest;<sup>3</sup> for of all the councils he was the head and leader, as Athanasius styles him.<sup>4</sup> By him was worded and drawn up the famous Nicene symbol or creed, as we are told in express terms by Athanasius.<sup>5</sup> He presided at the council of Sardica, which, at his request, was assembled by the Emperor Constans in 347.<sup>6</sup> From that council he retired to his bishopric, and continued there undisturbed till the year 355, when Constantius seeing himself master of the west, as well as of the east, undertook to oblige all the bishops to condemn Athanasius, whose cause was looked upon as inseparable from that of the orthodox faith. As Osius had on all occasions declared highly in his favor, and the example of a prelate so venerable for his age, for the glorious title of Confessor, and the figure he had made for many years in the church, greatly prejudiced the world against the enemies of the persecuted bishop, the emperor resolved to deprive, if possible, the orthodox party of so powerful a support. With this view he ordered Osius to repair to Milan, where the court then was, well knowing that he was not, like most other bishops, to be terrified with threatening letters. Osius, in compliance with the emperor's orders, set out without delay from Cordoua, notwithstanding his great age; and, arriving at Milan, was there received by the emperor with all the respect that was due to the "father of bishops," as he was styled. Constantius entertained him for some days with the utmost civility, hoping by that means to bring him into his views; but he no sooner named Athanasius to him, than the zealous prelate, well knowing the drift of his discourse, and armed against all temptations, interrupted him with declaring, that he was ready to sacrifice not one, but a thousand lives, in so just a cause; nay, he even reprimanded

the emperor with great freedom, who, out of an awful reverence for a prelate of his years, authority, and figure, heard him with great patience, and not only forbore offering him any violence, but gave him leave to return unmolested to his see.<sup>1</sup>

The mild treatment Osius met with gave great uneasiness to the Arian party, especially to the two bishops, Ursacius and Valens, who thereupon never ceased soliciting the emperor to proceed with vigor against the only man who, they said, was capable of obstructing his great and pious designs. They were powerfully seconded by the eunuchs, who prevailed in the end upon the emperor, as they bore a great sway at court, to try anew the firmness and constancy of so celebrated a champion. Constantius therefore wrote several letters to him, treating him in some with great respect, and styling him his father, but menacing him in others, and naming to him the bishops whom he had banished for refusing to condemn a man whom most bishops, and several councils, had already condemned.<sup>2</sup> Osius, inflexible and unmoved, answered the emperor by a letter worthy of himself, and the great reputation he had acquired. It has been conveyed to us by Athanasius, and nothing can be said stronger in that bishop's defence; for he there shows unanswerably, that, whatever crimes might be alleged against him, his only guilt was a steady adherence to the faith of Nice.<sup>3</sup> But Constantius, without hearkening to the reasons he urged in justification of his own and Athanasius's conduct, without paying the least regard to the earnest prayers and entreaties, to the paternal exhortations and admonitions, of so venerable a prelate, ordered him to quit his see forthwith, and repair to Sirmium, where he was kept a whole year in a kind of exile. But, unaffected with the many hardships he suffered there, with the loss of his dignity, with the inhuman treatment of his relations, who were all persecuted, stripped of their estates, and reduced to beggary on his account, Osius still stood up in defence of Athanasius, still rejected with indignation the proposals of his enemies,<sup>4</sup> striving to induce him at least to communicate with them. They therefore resolved to proceed to open force, and either to gain over to their party a man of his figure and rank, or, by removing him out of the way, to deprive the orthodox of their main support.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, with the emperor's consent and approbation, they caused him first to be closely confined, and afterwards to be cruelly beaten; and lastly to be put to the rack, and most inhumanly tortured, as if he had been the worst of criminals.<sup>6</sup> Even against such exquisite torments the firmness of his mind

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2, c. 73.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 1, c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Sulp. l. 2, c. 55; Theod. l. 2, c. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. fug. p. 703.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 837.

<sup>6</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 837—841.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ib. p. 838.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib. p. 838—840.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ib. p. 841; Sulp. l. 2, p. 162; Socr. l. 2, c. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. de fug. p. 704; Apol. 2, p. 807.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ib. Socr. p. 127.



Osius yields at last. He signs the Sirmian Confession of Faith. The Arians triumph. Hilarius not well informed as to the circumstances of his fall. He is restored to his see.

was proof for some time; but the weakness of his body obliged him in a manner to yield at last, and communicate with Ursacius and Valens.<sup>1</sup> Athanasius seems to insinuate, in some places, that he signed his condemnation;<sup>2</sup> but in another he expressly denies it.<sup>3</sup> Sulpitius Severus thinks he was guilty of no other crime but that of communicating with the Arians.<sup>4</sup> Athanasius only says, that he consented to communicate with Ursacius and Valens.<sup>5</sup> However, that he did not stop there, but signed the Arian confession of Sirmium, is but too manifest from several unexceptionable and contemporary writers. Phœbadius bishop of Agen, in France, in his answer written at this very time to the Arians, bragging that their doctrine had been approved and embraced by the great Osius, allows the fact; but adds, that he was induced thereunto by force, and not conviction.<sup>6</sup> Marcellinus and Faustinus, who wrote at the same time, say, that Osius set his hand, but never yielded his heart, to the Arian impiety.<sup>7</sup> Nay, Hilarius bishop of Poitiers supposes the Sirmian Confession of Faith to have been drawn up by Osius and Potamus; for he often calls it, "The heresy, the blasphemies, the wild and mad conceits of Osius and Potamus."<sup>8</sup> Vigilius Tapsensis ranks Osius with Ursacius, "and the other wicked men, who composed the sacrilegious confession of Sirmium."<sup>9</sup> Socrates writes, that he signed the Sirmian symbol;<sup>10</sup> Sozomen, that he consented to the suppression of the words Omoousion, and Omoiousion;<sup>11</sup> and Eusebius of Vercelli bestows high encomiums on Gregory bishop of Elvira, for opposing the great "transgressor Osius."<sup>12</sup> Potamus, whom I have mentioned above, was Bishop of Lisbon, and a most sanguine stickler for the orthodox party; but upon the emperor's yielding to him some lands of the imperial demesne, that lay very convenient for him, he changed sides, and became a most zealous champion of the Arian doctrine;<sup>13</sup> insomuch that he is ranked by Phœbadius with Ursacius and Valens, the two great apostles of the Arians.<sup>14</sup>

The fall of the great Osius, whom the orthodox party looked upon as their invincible hero, surprised the whole world.<sup>15</sup> Some could not believe it; others ascribed it to his great age, which might have weakened his judgment.<sup>16</sup> It was immediately published all over the east, and great rejoicings were made on the occasion, by the bishops in those

parts, who looked upon such a conquest as a signal victory over the orthodox.<sup>1</sup> Phœbadius tells us, that the chief argument alleged by the Arians, in favor of their doctrine, against the bishops of Gaul, was "the conversion of Osius," as they styled it.<sup>2</sup> Here Davidius pleases himself with ridiculing, and indeed very justly, this and several other conversions, greatly boasted by the Arians; but he must give me leave to put him in mind, that he ridicules, at the same time, the many conversions which his church is constantly boasting, since most of them, especially those thus made in the new world, have been owing to arguments of the same nature as that of Osius, and other Arian proselytes, and were not perhaps at all more sincere. Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers, who lived at this time in exile, amidst the Arians in Phrygia, seems not to be well informed as to the circumstances of the fall of Osius; else he had made some allowance for the barbarous and inhuman treatment the unhappy prelate met with, and not reflected on him with so much bitterness and severity, saying, that it had pleased God to prolong his life till he fell, that the world might know what he had been before he fell.<sup>3</sup> That a man in the hundredth year of his age should yield to most exquisite and repeated torments, is not at all to be wondered at: and therefore had Hilarius been better informed, he had rather pitied than reproached him. But the Arians, among whom he lived, took care to conceal whatever could anyways depreciate their boasted victory: at least that Hilarius was a stranger to what Osius had suffered, is manifest, from his ascribing the fall of that great prelate, not to the cruelty of his enemies, but to the too great love he had for his sepulchre,<sup>4</sup> meaning, I suppose, the desire he had of dying in his native country, and not in exile.

Osius having thus gratified the emperor, by communicating with the Arians, and signing the Sirmian Confession of Faith, he was immediately reinstated in his see, and suffered to return to his native country, where he gave some trouble, it seems, to the orthodox bishops; for Gregory bishop of Elvira is highly commended by Eusebius of Vercelli, who lived then in exile, "for opposing the transgressor Osius, as I have observed above. The unfortunate prelate did not live long after his fall, but died in the latter end of the same year 357, according to the most probable opinion. He did not forget the crime he had committed, says Athanasius;<sup>5</sup> but grievously complained, at the point of death, of the violence that had been offered him, anathematized the heresy of Arius, and exhorted, as by his last will, all mankind to reject it.<sup>6</sup> To his repentance Athanasius, no doubt, alludes, where he writes, that Osius yielded only for

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 841.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. de fug. p. 704, et apol. 2, p. 807.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ad Sol. p. 841.

<sup>4</sup> Sulp. l. 2, p. 161, 162.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 841.

<sup>6</sup> Phœbad. contr. Arian. p. 180.

<sup>7</sup> Marcell. et Faust. p. 34.

<sup>8</sup> Hil. de syn. p. 124, 125, 133.

<sup>9</sup> Vigil. in Eutychian. l. 5, n. 3.

<sup>10</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 12.

<sup>11</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 31.

<sup>12</sup> Hil frag. 2, p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Marcell. et Faust. p. 34.

<sup>14</sup> Phœbad. p. 169.

<sup>15</sup> Idem, p. 180; Soz. l. 4, c. 12.

<sup>16</sup> Sulp. l. 2, p. 161, 162.

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Hil. syn. p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ad Sol. p. 141, et 842.

<sup>4</sup> Phœbad. p. 180.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib. p. 137.

<sup>6</sup> Idem ib.



Constantius appoints a council to meet at Nicomedia; which city is destroyed by an earthquake. The council appointed to meet at Nicé. Two councils appointed to meet instead of one. The occasion of this change.

a time;<sup>1</sup> which he says of no other, not even of Liberius. As for the account, which some writers give of his tragical end,<sup>2</sup> it is not worthy of notice. The Greek church honors him as a saint, and his festival is kept on the 27th of August;<sup>3</sup> but they are certainly mistaken in supposing him to have died in banishment. The case of Osius deserves, without all doubt, to be greatly pitied. But it would be still more worthy of our pity and compassion, had he been himself an enemy to all persecution. But it must be observed, that he was the author and promoter of the first Christian persecution. For it was he who first stirred up Constantine against the Donatists; many of whom were sent into exile, and some even sentenced to death, nay, and led to the place of execution. I dare not interpret the very severe treatment he met with, or his fall and apostasy, as a judgment; but cannot help thinking him, on that consideration, less worthy of our compassion and concern than a man of his years and merit would otherwise have been.

Constantius, having thus gained over to the heterodox party the celebrated Bishop of Cordoua, and sent those into exile whom he apprehended most capable of traversing his design, resolved to assemble a council, not doubting but he should be able, by some means or other, to prevail upon the members that composed it to approve and embrace the doctrine, which he was laboring with indefatigable pains to establish. Accordingly he wrote to the chief bishops of each province, enjoining them to meet in the name of the rest, at an appointed time, in the city of Nicomedia.<sup>4</sup> In compliance with his orders the bishops immediately set out; but, while they were on the road, they were stopped by the news that was brought them of the utter destruction of the city of Nicomedia by a sudden and most dreadful earthquake. This public calamity happened on the 24th of August, 358,<sup>5</sup> and the Arians, in the account which they transmitted of it to court, assured the emperor, that several bishops, who were for consubstantiality, had been buried under the ruins of the great church.<sup>6</sup> It was probably, by this account, that Philostorgius was deceived and misled, when he wrote, that fifteen bishops, who were all defenders of consubstantiality, were crushed to pieces by the fall of the church, together with Cecrops, bishop of the city.<sup>7</sup> But Sozomen assures us, that, when the church fell, there was not a single person in it; and that two bishops only perished in the earthquake, namely, Cecrops, who was an Arian, and a bishop of Bosphorus.<sup>8</sup> This misfortune obliged the emperor to change the place of the council;

and accordingly letters were immediately despatched to all the bishops, ordering them to repair to Nice, which city was suggested to him by Basilus, the Semi-Arian bishop of Ancyra, with a design, says Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> to eclipse the glory and authority of the first council by the confusion of two. Be that as it will, the bishops were ordered to meet there early in the summer of the year 359. Such as were not in a condition to undertake such a journey, on account of their age or infirmities, were to send priests or deacons, as their deputies, to vote and act in their name; and the council was strictly enjoined to transmit to the emperor such decrees as they should enact, that he might examine them, and see whether they were agreeable to Scripture: for this purpose ten deputies were to be appointed by the bishops of the east, and the like number by those of the west.<sup>2</sup> But while the world was expecting to see a second œcumenical council assembled at Nice, the emperor all on a sudden changed his mind, and instead of one, resolved to convene two, the one in the east, and the other in the west.<sup>3</sup> This change was owing to the intrigues of the Anomeans, or Pure Arians, who, finding the far greater part of the bishops either for the orthodox faith of Nice, or the Semi-Arian, as established in a council at Antioch, concluded, that there would be no means to divert them, when assembled together, from condemning their doctrine; whereas if they were divided, they did not despair of being able to manage both assemblies, or at least one of the two.<sup>4</sup> This design of dividing the council they privately imparted to the eunuch Eusebius, their great friend, and the emperor's chief favorite, who, highly applauding the scheme, took upon him to get it approved by Constantius. And this he easily effected, by representing, that a general council would put the bishops to greater trouble and inconveniences than most of them could well bear, and, at the same time, the treasury to an immense charge; for on such occasions their expenses were defrayed by the emperor.<sup>5</sup> He therefore advised him to assemble two councils at the same time, one in the east, and the other in the west, which, he said, would be less troublesome to the bishops, and less expensive to the exchequer. To these reasons Constantius acquiesced; but, as he was a zealous Semi-Arian, Eusebius kept him in the dark as to the true motive of such a change. Thus was Constantius, and thus have many princes been, since his time, led, as it were, hoodwinked, by some in whom they reposed an entire confidence, into measures tending to promote designs quite opposite to their own.

This point being settled, to the great satisfaction of the Anomeans, Ariminum, now

<sup>1</sup> Idem de frag. p. 704, et apol. 2, p. 807.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Isidor. de vir. ill. in Osio, c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Menæa, p. 293.

<sup>4</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 16, et l. 3, c. 19; Athan. de syn. p. 873.

<sup>5</sup> Greg. Nyss. de facto, p. 75.

<sup>7</sup> Philost. l. 4, c. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Soz. ib.

<sup>8</sup> Soz. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. l. 1, c. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 16; Athan. de syn. p. 869.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. ib. p. 870.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ib. p. 873, 874; Soz. l. 4, c. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ib. et c. 17.



Rimini chosen for the western bishops; and Seleucia in Isauria for those of the east. The emperor's letter to the western bishops. The Arians propose a new confession drawn up at Sirmium.

Rimini, on the Adriatic sea, was thought the most proper place for the western bishops to meet at. But the city of Nice, where the general council was to assemble, having suffered much by the late earthquake, the emperor desired the eastern bishops might not meet there, but in whatever other place they should agree among themselves to be the most proper and convenient.<sup>1</sup> This Theodoret ascribes to a particular providence, that would not suffer the great council of Nice to be ever confounded with a conventicle of heretics.<sup>2</sup> As the bishops could not agree about the place, and it was not at all probable they should, the emperor, by the advice of a few, who were then with him at Sirmium, named the city of Seleucia in Isauria.<sup>3</sup> And now that the place was settled for both councils, Constantius issued an order, enjoining not only the chief bishops of each province, as he had done the year before, but all, without exception, to repair to one of the two;<sup>4</sup> nay, he despatched officers into the provinces, with a strict charge to see his order punctually obeyed, and put in execution.<sup>5</sup> The bishops therefore set out from all parts; the public carriages, roads, and houses, were everywhere crowded with them; which gave great offence to the catechumens, and no small diversion to the pagans, who thought it equally strange and ridiculous, that men, who had been brought up from their infancy in the Christian religion, and whose business it was to instruct others in that belief, should be constantly hurrying, in their old age, from one place to another, to know what they themselves should believe.<sup>6</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus complains, that the necessary funds for the maintenance of the public carriages were quite drained and exhausted, by the roaming about of the Christian bishops.<sup>7</sup> Their charges were defrayed by the emperor, as I have observed above; but the bishops of Gaul and Britain, that they might be the more independent, insisted upon travelling at their own expense; only three of the latter, not having wherewithal to support themselves, chose rather to be obliged to the emperor than burdensome to their colleagues, who generously offered to contribute to their maintenance, everyone according to his ability.<sup>8</sup>

The western bishops, that is, those of Illyricum, Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain, being assembled at Rimini, in all four hundred and upwards,<sup>9</sup> the emperor wrote to Taurus, the Præfectus Prætorio of Italy, charging him to be present at all the debates, and not to suffer the bishops to separate, till, in points of faith, they had all agreed: if he succeeded therein, he was to be rewarded with the consular dignity.<sup>10</sup> At the same time he wrote to

the bishops, enjoining them to treat only of such matters as related to the faith, unity, and order of the church, and forbidding them to meddle, on any pretence whatsoever, with what concerned the eastern bishops, who, he said, would take care to settle their own affairs, since they were met for that purpose.<sup>1</sup> This was to prevent their entering upon the cause of Athanasius, whom he well knew the western bishops would have declared innocent. The emperor's letter is dated the 27th of May, 359.<sup>2</sup> At this council Restitutus bishop of Carthage is supposed to have presided, as he was, both for piety and learning, the most conspicuous in the assembly. At their first meeting, the two Arian bishops, Ursacius and Valens, appeared with a paper in their hands, containing a new confession of faith, composed lately at Sirmium by the emperor, by a small number of Arian and Semi-Arian bishops, and several presbyters and deacons, who, after a debate, which lasted the whole day, had at length agreed to suppress the word *consubstantial*, and introduce the word *like* in its room; so that the Son was no more to be said *consubstantial*, but *like to the Father in all things*; the three last words Constantius added, and, by obliging all who were present to sign them, defeated, say the Semi-Arians, the wicked designs of the heretics, meaning the pure Arians.<sup>3</sup> However, excepting those words, the whole confession was thought to favor their doctrine;<sup>4</sup> whence the Semi-Arians held out till night, when the emperor, well satisfied with the words *like in all things*, obliged them to sign it. This confession of faith was drawn up, and signed,<sup>5</sup> on the eve of Pentecost,<sup>6</sup> that is, on the 22d or

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 43, 44.

<sup>2</sup> Idem. ib. p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 876; Hil. frag. 1, p. 44; Epiph. hæres. 73, c. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Hil. and Epiph. ib.

<sup>5</sup> It was signed by the few bishops who were present, and by a good number of presbyters and deacons. The bishops were Marcus of Arethusa, George, who had been intruded into the see of Alexandria, Basilus of Ancyra, Germinius of Sirmium, Hypatianus of Heraclea, Valens, Ursacius, and Pancratius of Pelusium, (Athan. de syn. p. 873; Epi. 73, c. 22; Socr. l. 2, c. 29.) Valens, in signing it, added to his name these words: *I believe the Son to be like to the Father*. He was unwilling to acknowledge the Son like to the Father in *all things*, agreeably to the confession, which he was to sign, and therefore suppressed these words. But the emperor, insisting upon his adding them, he took his will for the rule of his faith, and added them accordingly. Basilus of Ancyra, suspecting some meaning contrary to the doctrine which he held, to lie concealed and disguised under those words, declared, that he understood by them a likeness in *substance*, in *existence*, and in *essence*; and that he signed in this, and no other sense, the present symbol. Not satisfied with this declaration, he wrote, some time after, an exposition of the faith that was professed by him, and the other Semi-Arian bishops. This exposition is, by Epiphanius, styled a letter, and was placed by him after the circular letter of the council of Ancyra. The present confession of Sirmium is commonly styled the third, but was, properly speaking, the fourth: for before this, three different Symbols had been composed at Sirmium; namely, one entirely orthodox, in 351, another altogether Arian, in 357, a third Semi-Arian, in 358, and the present in 359. The second Liberius signed at Berœa, and the third at Sirmium, upon his arrival in that city.

<sup>6</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 44; Epiph. hæres. 73, c. 22.

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 4, c. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 39; Soz. l. 4, c. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Hil. de syn. p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 870.

<sup>5</sup> Sulp. l. 4, c. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 874; Sulp. l. 2, p. 162; Soz. p. 563.

<sup>7</sup> Hier. p. 143; Sulp. p. 162.

<sup>8</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Sulp. l. 2, p. 164.

<sup>10</sup> Ammian. l. 21, p. 203.



The new confession of the Arians rejected; and they condemned and deposed. Deputies sent to the emperor, who leaves Constantinople without seeing them. The Arians get deputies ordered to Nice, in Thrace.

23d of May, 359:<sup>1</sup> Easter having fallen that year on the 4th of April.<sup>2</sup> Ursacius and Valens read it to the council, adding, when they had done, that it had been approved of by the emperor, and therefore that they ought all to be satisfied with it, without recurring to any other councils or creeds, without demanding any other confession of the heretics, or inquiring too narrowly into their doctrine and opinions, which would be attended with much trouble, endless disputes and eternal divisions; that the catholic truths, which all men were bound to believe, ought not to be darkened with metaphysical terms, but expressed by words, which all men understood; and, lastly, that it was quite idle to quarrel and make so much noise about a word (meaning the word *consubstantial*) which none of the inspired writers had thought fit to make use of in explaining the mysteries of our holy religion.<sup>3</sup> What answer the council returned, I can find nowhere recorded. But a motion being made soon after to condemn and anathematize the Arian and all other heresies, Ursacius and his party opposed it; which alarmed the orthodox bishops, concluding from thence, that whatever expressions they made use of, their belief was different from that of the catholic church. They therefore resolved to hearken to them no longer; and accordingly, without the least regard to their remonstrances and protestations, they condemned, with one consent, all heretics in general, and that of Arius in particular; declared heretical the confession of faith presented by Ursacius and Valens; confirmed that of Nice, and ordered the word *consubstantial* to be retained, since the true meaning of it might be sufficiently gathered from several passages in Scripture.<sup>4</sup> They did not stop here; but, transported with zeal on the Arians attempting to impose upon them by a second confession of faith, they declared them all, and their leaders Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Caius, by name, ignorant and deceitful men, impostors, heretics, deposed them in the council, and signed all to a man this declaration on the 21st of July of the present year 359.<sup>5</sup>

With this act they put an end to the sessions, and immediately despatched ten deputies to acquaint the emperor with what had passed, pursuant to his express command. The like number was sent by the Arians, who had assisted at the council. These, travelling with great expedition, arrived at Constantinople, where the court then was, some time before the others; and, being immediately admitted to the emperor, they prejudiced him to such a degree against the orthodox party, that he would not so much as see their deputies, pretending to be wholly taken up with the affairs of the state. They were therefore

obliged to deliver the letter, which the council had written on this occasion, to one of his ministers.<sup>1</sup> They expected every day to be admitted to an audience, or, at least, to receive an answer, and be dismissed. But, after they had been thus kept for some time in expectation, the emperor all on a sudden left Constantinople, in order to head his army against the barbarians, who had broken into the empire. He was no sooner gone than one of the ministers came to acquaint them, that it was the emperor's pleasure they should repair forthwith to Adrianople, and there wait his return.<sup>2</sup> However, before he set out, he wrote to the council, giving them notice of his sudden departure from Constantinople; and alleging, by way of excuse for not having seen or heard their deputies, the present situation of public affairs, which had engrossed his whole attention, whereas, the discussing and settling of spiritual affairs required a mind quite free and disengaged from all worldly cares. He concluded his short letter with entreating them not to think of separating till he was at leisure to settle, in conjunction with them, matters of so great importance to the church, and the whole Christian world.<sup>3</sup> The design of the most wicked Constantius, as Athanasius styles him,<sup>4</sup> was to tire out the bishops with such delays, hoping they would, in the end, choose rather to sign the last Sirmian confession, which he was bent upon establishing in the room of the Nicene, than to be long kept, as it were, in exile, at a distance from their sees.<sup>5</sup> But this he could not compass for the present, the bishops declaring, in their answer to his letter, that they could not, and hoped they never should, upon any consideration whatsoever, depart from what they had so unanimously settled and decreed.<sup>6</sup> Socrates writes, that the bishops, after having waited some time in vain for the emperor's answer to their letter, left Rimini, and retired to their respective sees.<sup>7</sup> And here he ends his account of that council. It were greatly to be wished, that nothing else could be said of it; but several contemporary and unexceptionable writers, and Hilarius among the rest,<sup>8</sup> assure us, that Constantius *changed at last the faith of the western bishops into impiety*. Of this deplorable change they give us the following account.

The Arians, taking occasion from the last letter of the bishops at Rimini to incense Constantius against them, prevailed upon him to order their deputies to a city in Thrace, known at that time by the name of Nice, but formerly called Ostudizus, and placed by Sanson a few leagues to the east of Adrianople. This place they chose, that the symbol, which they designed to impose upon them,

<sup>1</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 875.

<sup>2</sup> Buch. cycl.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. Soz. ib. Theod. l. 1, c. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. ib. p. 876; Soz. ib. Hil. frag. 2, p. 47, 48.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ib. Socr. l. 1, c. 37; Hil. frag. 2, p. 46.

<sup>1</sup> Sulp. l. 2, p. 163; Athan. ad Afr. p. 934; Hil. frag. 2, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. ib. Athan. de syn. p. 930.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. de syn. p. 929, 930. <sup>4</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 15, 16.

<sup>6</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>7</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 37.

<sup>8</sup> Hil. in cons. l. 1, p. 113.



The deputies of the Arians sign the Sirmian confession. Constantius orders the bishops at Rimini to suppress the words *substance* and *consubstantial*. The greater part yield. The others imposed upon by the Arians.

might be confounded by the ignorant people with that of the great council of Nice in Bithynia.<sup>1</sup> The deputies no sooner arrived there, than a confession of faith was proposed to them entirely agreeable to the last made at Sirmium, except that in this new creed the Son was declared *like to the Father*, without the addition of the words *in all things*. This they rejected at first with great resolution and intrepidity; but the Arians were no less resolute, and therefore left nothing unattempted they could think of to carry their point.<sup>2</sup> But finding hope and fear, threats and promises, equally ineffectual, they proceeded at last to open force and violence.<sup>3</sup> What kind of violence was employed against them, the author does not tell us; but Marcellinus and Faustinus ascribe their retracting what they had declared to be holy, and approving what they had condemned as impious, to the love of their sees, and the dread they were in of being driven from them.<sup>4</sup> Be that as it will, it is certain, that they yielded at last; that they accepted and signed, without the least limitation or restriction, the above-mentioned confession of faith; consented to the suppression of the word *consubstantial*; declared void and null all the acts and proceedings of the council of Rimini; anathematized, as heretical, all opinions contrary to the doctrine contained in the said confession; and, finally, admitted to their communion Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and Caius, whom they had not long before deposed as heretics.<sup>5</sup> Restitutus, Bishop of Carthage, and one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church, signed the first, and the other deputies after him, according to the dignity of their sees. The emperor, transported with joy at the news of their compliance, which he looked upon as a signal victory, gave them immediately leave to return to Rimini. At the same time he wrote to Taurus, charging him anew not to suffer the bishops to depart till they had all signed the same confession of faith, and empowering him to send into exile such as by their obstinacy should distinguish themselves above the rest, provided they were not above fifteen in number.<sup>6</sup> He likewise wrote to the bishops, commanding them, on pain of incurring his indignation, to suppress for ever the words *substance* and *consubstantial*, severely reprimanding them for presuming to depose Ursacius and his colleagues, and assuring them, that they should not be allowed to return to their sees, till they had entitled themselves to his favor by an entire and unreserved compliance with his will.<sup>7</sup> To this letter the Arians, who had assisted at the council, to the number of eighty, returned a most submissive answer, and even thanked

the emperor for the great pains he took to establish the true doctrine.<sup>1</sup> However, Taurus declared that he could by no means suffer them to depart till the rest had agreed with them, and the whole assembly was of one mind. The orthodox bishops showed at first some resolution, and even refused to communicate with their own deputies. But this resolution soon vanished; they were eager to return to their sees; the emperor was inflexible; Taurus took care to render the place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their example, the rest began to waver, and, being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the Arian party in such crowds, that in a very short time the number of the orthodox bishops, who continued steady, was reduced to twenty.<sup>2</sup> At the head of these was Phœbadius, the celebrated bishop of Agen, who seemed invincible; but nevertheless was overcome in the end, not by the menaces of the emperor, or his prefect, but by the craft and subtilty of Ursacius and Valens, who, finding they could by no other means prevail upon him to accept the Sirmian confession, declared, that to put an end to the unhappy divisions that had so long rent the church, they had at last resolved to agree to such alterations and additions as should be judged proper and necessary by him and his colleagues. This declaration was received by all with great joy: Phœbadius triumphed, thinking he had carried his point, and saved the reputation of the council. To the symbol were immediately added several anathemas against the Arian heresy, and an article declaring *the Son equal to the Father, without beginning, and before all time*. When this article was read, Valens desired, that, in order to leave no room for new disputes or chicanery, they would add, that *the Son was not a creature like other creatures*.<sup>3</sup> This was evidently supposing the Son to be a creature only exalted above all other creatures; so that by admitting such an article they condemned the doctrine which they designed to establish, and established that which they designed to condemn. And yet of this neither was Phœbadius aware, nor any of his party, as they afterwards solemnly declared.<sup>4</sup> A most unaccountable oversight, and hardly credible! But Theodoret,<sup>5</sup> Ambrose,<sup>6</sup> Sulpitius Severus,<sup>7</sup> and Fulgentius,<sup>8</sup> took it upon their word, and so must we. Neither party could brag of the victory; for the Arians had anathematized the heresy of Arius; and on the other hand the orthodox bishops had deliberately agreed to the suppressing of the words *substance* and *consubstantial*, and inadvertently acknowledged the Son to be a creature; which was all the Arians aimed at, or could desire. The council being thus ended, new deputies were sent

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 2, c. 16; Hil. in ann. p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Marc. et Faust. p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 36, 37; Theod. ib.; Sulp. l. 2, p. 165.

<sup>6</sup> Athan. ad Afr. p. 941; Sulp. p. 165; Marc. et Faust. p. 26; Hil. frag. p. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Athan. ib. p. 934.

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 37, 38.

<sup>2</sup> Sulp. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Sulp. l. 2, p. 166.

<sup>5</sup> Sulp. p. 166.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. l. 1, c. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Ambros. de fid. l. 3, c. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Fulg. in Pint. c. 3, p. 536.



They discover their mistake. Are judged guilty by the exiled bishops. Great disagreement in the council of Seleucia. The semi-Arians condemn and depose the Arians. They sign the last confession of Sirmium. The Arians, in their turn, condemn and depose the semi-Arians, and also sign the last confession of Sirmium.

to acquaint the emperor with what had passed, who being highly pleased with the report made by Urfacius and Valens (for they were at the head of the deputation) immediately granted the bishops leave to return to their respective sees, after they had been about four months at Rimini.

The council no sooner broke up than the Arians began to proclaim aloud the victory they had gained, bragging, that it had not been defined in the council of Rimini, that the Son was not a creature, but only that he was not like other creatures; and declaring it was, and had always been their opinion, that the Son was no more like the Father, than a piece of glass was like an emerald.<sup>1</sup> Phœbadius, and the other bishops who had adhered to him, were returned to their sees with great joy, flattering themselves that they had sufficiently established the catholic doctrine, and prevented all future disputes: but, finding that the Arians pretended their tenets had been confirmed by this very council, and seriously reflecting on the articles, which they themselves had agreed to, they discovered at last how grossly they had been imposed upon, and publicly retracted all they had said, done, or signed, repugnant to the truths of the catholic church.<sup>2</sup> However, Gregory bishop of Elvira refused to communicate with any of the bishops who had assisted at the council of Rimini, and was on that account commended by Eusebius of Vercelli.<sup>3</sup> The exiled bishops, and those who lay concealed, agreed among themselves by letters, to declare them for ever incapable of performing any episcopal or sacerdotal functions, and to admit them to the communion of the church only in the capacity of laymen.<sup>4</sup> When peace was restored to the church by the death of Constantius in 361, most of the orthodox bishops were for deposing all those of the council of Rimini, and placing others in their room. But this sentence the people would not suffer to be put in execution, rising every where in defence of their pastors, and in some places insulting, beating, and even killing, those who came to depose them.<sup>5</sup>

As for the council of Seleucia, it met on the 27th of September 359, and consisted only of one hundred and sixty bishops, all Arians, or semi-Arians, except twelve or thirteen orthodox bishops from Egypt.<sup>6</sup> This assembly Gregory Nazianzen calls the Tower of Calane, or Babel, the council of Caiaphas.<sup>7</sup> And indeed with a great deal of reason; for nothing was there seen but tumult, confusion, and disorder. The Anomeans and semi-Arians appeared so irreconcilably incensed against each other, and carried on their debates with so much animosity and bitterness,

that the Quæstor Leonas, whom the emperor had appointed to assist at the council, thinking it impossible they should ever agree in any one point, rose up at their fourth meeting, while they were in the heat of dispute, and, withdrawing abruptly, put an end to that session, nay, and to the council; for, being invited the next day, the first of October, to the assembly, he refused to go, saying, that he did not conceive his presence to be at all necessary, since they might quarrel and scold as much as they pleased without him.<sup>1</sup> This he did, says Sozomen, to favour the Anomeans, who thence took occasion to absent themselves from the council, which, as it was chiefly composed of semi-Arians, seemed determined to condemn their doctrine.<sup>2</sup> However, the semi-Arians met by themselves; and, finding they could by no means prevail upon the Anomeans to return to the council, they condemned their doctrine as heretical and blasphemous, excommunicated and deposed the leading men of their party, appointed others in their room, and gave notice thereof to their respective churches.<sup>3</sup> Before they broke up, they despatched ten deputies to acquaint the emperor with the transactions of the council. But the bishops whom they had deposed, arriving at court before them, and being by their friends there immediately introduced to Constantius, they prejudiced him against the council of Seleucia to such a degree, that it was some time before he could prevail upon himself to hear the deputies. However, he heard them at last, and, by threatening them with exile if they did not comply, obliged them to sign the last confession of Sirmium, which had been rejected by the council as Arian.<sup>4</sup> In this he spent the whole day, and great part of the night, preceding the first of January, though he was obliged to make the necessary preparations for entering on that day his tenth consulate with the usual pomp and solemnity.<sup>5</sup>

In the beginning of the year 360 the Anomeans assembling by themselves at Constantinople, as the semi-Arians had done at Seleucia, in order to ingratiate themselves with the emperor, not only received the last Sirmian confession, but condemned all other confessions or symbols that had been made till then, or should be made for the future. They then declared all the acts of the council of Seleucia void and null; and, to be even with the semi-Arians, deposed, under various pretences, such of their party as had most contributed to the deposing of them, and even prevailed upon the emperor to send them into exile.<sup>6</sup>

They did not stop here, but obtained of

<sup>1</sup> Hil. frag. 1, p. 53, 54.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Hil. frag. 2, p. 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Mar. & Faust. p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. ib.

<sup>6</sup> Ath. de syn. p. 881;

<sup>7</sup> Greg. Naz. or. 21. p. 386. Hil. in cons. l. 1. p. 114.

<sup>1</sup> Socr. l. 2. c. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 4. c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 40. Ath. de syn. p. 881. Basil. in Eunom. l. 1. p. 697. Sulp. l. 1. p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> Hil. in cons. l. 1. p. 115. Soz. l. 4. c. 23. Basil. ep. 74.

<sup>5</sup> Soz. l. 4. c. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Socr. l. 2, c. 12. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Philost. l. 5. c. 1.



An order from the emperor injoining all bishops to sign the Sirmian confession. It was probably signed by Liberius. Arianism universally obtains. Constantius designs to establish the doctrine of the pure Arians; but is prevented by death.

Constantius an order, which was published throughout the empire, commanding all Bishops to sign the Sirmian confession, on pain of forfeiting their dignity, and being sent into exile.<sup>1</sup> (\*) This order was executed with the utmost rigor in all the provinces of the empire, and very few were found, who did not sign with their hands what they condemned in their hearts.<sup>2</sup> Many, who till then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the times; and such as did not, were driven, without distinction, from their sees, into exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that confession being a qualification indispensibly requisite both for obtaining and keeping the episcopal dignity.<sup>3</sup> Thus were all the sees throughout the empire filled with Arians, insomuch that in the whole east not one orthodox bishop was left, and in the west, but one, namely, Gregory bishop of Elvira in Andalusia, and he, in all likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his flock, and lie concealed, as were probably pope Liberius, and Vincentius of Capua, if what Theodoret relates of them be true, namely, that they never consented to the decrees of Rimini,<sup>4</sup> and thereby retrieved the reputation they had lost, the former by signing the Sirmian confession of the year 357, and the other by communicating with the Arians in 353, as I have related above. But what Theodoret writes may be justly called in question; for it is not at all probable, that the emperor, and the Arian party, so warmly bent on establishing that confession throughout the empire, would have suffered the bishop of the imperial city, of the first see, to reject it, without deposing him, as they had done the bishops of all the other great sees, and appointing another more compliant in his room. This could not be prevented by his concealing himself in the caverns and cemeteries about Rome, as he is said to have done in his acts quoted by Baronius,<sup>5</sup> though he might by that

means have escaped being sent into exile. Besides, had he, instead of complying with the emperor's express command, withdrawn and absconded, I cannot think that his antagonist Felix, who was still alive, and had done nothing we know of to disoblige the emperor, and the Arian party, by whom he had been formerly raised to that see, would have neglected so favorable an opportunity of recovering his ancient dignity. If what Theodoret says be true, Gregory Nazianzen is highly to blame for not excepting Liberius, when he writ, that the bishops either all complied, or were driven into exile, excepting a few, who were too insignificant to be taken notice of by the emperor, or his ministers.<sup>1</sup> Be that as it will, it is certain, that at this time the Arian doctrine universally obtained; that the face of the church appeared quite deformed and disfigured;<sup>2</sup> that the whole world saw itself, with astonishment, all on a sudden become Arian;<sup>3</sup> that the boat of St. Peter, to use St. Jerom's expression, tossed by furious winds, by violent storms, was upon the point of sinking, and no hopes of safety seemed to be left.<sup>4</sup>

The following year 361, the Anomeans, not fully satisfied with the confession of faith, which, at their suggestion, the emperor had taken so much pains to establish throughout the empire, assembled, with his leave, at Antioch, and there drew up a new symbol, or creed, wherein it was expressly said, that "the Son was in every thing unlike to the Father," and that "He was made out of nothing." Constantius had formerly expressed the greatest abhorrence to this doctrine, and had even banished those who held, and refused to anathematize, such "impious blasphemies," as he then styled them.<sup>5</sup> But, having lately changed his opinion, which was chiefly owing to the great influence the eunuch Eusebius had over him, he was now no less sanguine for the unlikeness of the Son to the Father, than he had been hitherto for the likeness.<sup>6</sup> In order therefore to abolish the ancient, and establish this new creed in its room, he appointed a council to meet at Nice in Bithynia,<sup>7</sup> which, without all doubt, he would have treated in the same manner as he had done that of Rimini. But, as the bishops were preparing to set out for the appointed place, they were stopped by the sudden and unexpected news of the emperor's death, which put an end to all his councils, and was heard with equal joy by those of the orthodox and semi-Arian party. He was succeeded by Julian, surnamed the Apostate, who immediately recalled all those who had been banished by Constantius on account of their religion.<sup>8</sup> Whatever was his

<sup>1</sup> Sox. l. 4. c. 26.

(\*) This confession is called sometime the confession of Nice in Thrace, and sometimes the confession of Rimini; but it differed from both. By the confession of Nice, the Son was acknowledged to be like to the Father, without the addition of the words "in all Things," which were an essential part of the last confession of Sirmium. In that of Rimini the Son was said "not to be a creature like other creatures," and there were no such words in the confession of Sirmium. But by all three the word consubstantial was rejected, and no other would satisfy the orthodox, acknowledging the Son to be "of the same substance with the Father." Both the Arians and semi-Arians allowed the Son to be like to the Father: but that likeness was by them very differently understood and interpreted. The Arians held him to be like rather by grace than by nature, and as like as a creature could be to the Creator. (a) The semi-Arians confessed him to be like in nature, in existence, in essence, in substance, and in every thing else. But the orthodox maintained him to be of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same existence, essence, &c. and, to express this sameness of identity, they chose the word consubstantial.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. Naz. orat. 21. p. 387. <sup>3</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Theod. l. 2. c. 17. <sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 48.

(a) Ruff. l. 1. c. 25.

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Naz. orat. l. p. 387. <sup>2</sup> Ruff. l. 1. c. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. in Lucifer. p. 143. & in chron.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. l. 2. c. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Ath. de syn. p. 906.

<sup>7</sup> Philost. l. 6. c. 5. <sup>8</sup> Socr. l. 3. c. 1.



The exiled bishops recalled by Julian. The council of Alexandria. A schism formed by Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari. He never returned to the communion of the church.

motive, the church reaped great advantages from the return of so many eminent prelates, who, in the worst of times, had, with an invincible firmness and constancy, stood up in her defence. Among the rest returned, on this occasion, the famous Meletius bishop of Antioch, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, who had been all three confined to the most distant parts of Thebais in Egypt, Cyril of Jerusalem, Pelagius of Laodicea in Phœnicia, and, to the inexpressible joy of the orthodox party, their great champion Athanasius bishop of Alexandria,<sup>1</sup> who immediately resumed, undisturbed, his episcopal function; George, the usurper of his see, having been assassinated a little while before by the pagans of Alexandria, on account of his avarice and cruelty.<sup>2</sup> In other places the orthodox bishops, finding the Arians in possession of their sees, contented themselves with being acknowledged by those of their communion, without attempting to drive out their antagonists, which would have created great confusion, and endless disturbances in the church. Julian refused to interpose his authority in favor of either party, saying, that as he was not so well acquainted with the nature of their disputes as a just and impartial judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuse him, lest he should be guilty of some injustice, and settle matters of such importance among themselves. Athanasius entered Alexandria in a kind of triumph, which is described in a lively manner by Gregory Nazianzen, who seems to have pleased himself with displaying, in that description, all the eloquence he was master of.<sup>3</sup>

The bishop of Alexandria being thus reinstated, and again at full liberty to exert his zeal for the catholic cause, his first care was to retrieve his fallen brethren, and reunite them to the church. With this view he assembled, in 362, a council at Alexandria, composed only of confessors, that is, of such bishops as had chosen rather to forfeit their dignities and sees, than receive or sign the Arian confession of Rimini or Sirmium. This was one of the most respectable councils that was ever held in the church, not so much in regard of the numbers (for I find not above twenty named) as of the merit, virtue, and sanctity of the members that composed it. The chief subject of their debates, or rather inquiries, was to find out the most proper means of restoring tranquillity to the church, after so dreadful a storm. Some, and among the rest Lucifer bishop of Cagliari, who did not assist in person, but by his deputies, the two deacons Herennius and Agapetus, were for deposing all those who had signed the confession of Rimini, and cutting them off from the communion of the church. But this unseasonable severity was condemned by the far greater part, as

tending to raise a new storm, and involve the church in greater troubles than ever, which the emperor Julian would take care to improve, to the total ruin of the Christian religion. Athanasius therefore was for using severity only with the authors, and chief promoters, of the late general defection: and his opinion prevailed; for a decree was enacted, importing, that the authors of the late general prevarication should, even upon their repentance, be received to the communion of the church only in the capacity of laymen, but that the rest should be all kept in, or restored to, their sees, upon their publicly renouncing the Arian communion, and embracing the faith of Nice.<sup>1</sup> This decree was every where received with the greatest joy, the bishop Cagliari being the only man, either in the east or west, who opposed it, and that with so much obstinacy, that, rather than yield, he chose to separate himself from the communion of the rest, and to form a new schism, which bore his name, and soon gained a considerable footing, especially in the west; several persons no less distinguished for piety than learning, and among the rest Gregory, the famous bishop of Elvira, having adopted the sentiments of a man, who had suffered so much for the purity of the faith. As Lucifer is honored by the church of Rome as a saint, and his festival is kept on the 20th of May,<sup>2</sup> Baronius pretends, that he abandoned his schism, and returned to the communion of the church, before his death.<sup>3</sup> But his contemporary Ruffinus, who probably knew him, assures us, that he died in the schism, which he had formed.<sup>4</sup> Jerom often speaks of his schism, but no where gives us the least hint of his having ever quitted it; which would have afforded him a strong argument against the Luciferians, and he would not have failed to urge it, in the book which he wrote to convince them of their error. That writer speaks of Lucifer, on all occasions, with the greatest respect, even in the book which he writ against his followers: he owns, that his intention was pure and upright; that it was not pride, thirst after glory, or a desire of transmitting his name to posterity, but a mistaken zeal, that led him astray, and made him disapprove what the others approved; he even distinguishes him with the title of the Blessed Lucifer.<sup>5</sup> And hence Baronius concludes, that he returned to the communion of the church; for otherwise, says the annalist,<sup>6</sup> St. Jerom had never given him the title of blessed or saint. But that he did not return, is manifest, from the silence of St. Jerom on that head, and from the authority of a contemporary writer quoted above: and hence I may draw a conclusion far better grounded than that of Baronius; namely, that

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 3. c. 2. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ammian. l. 22. p. 223. Soz. l. 4. c. 30. Philost. l. 7. c. 2. Epiph. p. 912.

<sup>3</sup> Greg. Naz. 21.

<sup>1</sup> Ruf. l. 1. c. 28. Ath. ad Ruf. t. 2. p. 41. Amb. de salv. p. 316. Aug. ep. 50. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Bolland, Maii 20. p. 207. <sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.

<sup>4</sup> Ruf. l. 1. c. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. in Lucif. p. 144.

<sup>6</sup> Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.



The council of Alexandria saves the church from ruin. The faith of Nice every where established. A council convened by the semi-Arians.

St. Jerom excused him on account of his good intention; and, consequently, that he did not hold the uncharitable doctrine of the church of Rome, excluding from salvation all who die out of her communion, let their intention be never so good. It is to be observed, that the Luciferians not only excluded from their communion those who had received the Arian confession, but all who communicated with them, even after they had anathematized that confession, and publicly embraced the faith of Nice.

The resolution taken by the confessors in the council of Alexandria, is said to have saved the church from utter ruin. For had that prevailed, which was urged with so much warmth by Lucifer, the bishops, who had chosen rather to sign the Arian confession than forfeit their sees, would have kept them in defiance of a decree made by a small number of their colleagues, and in all likelihood excommunicated and deposed, in their turn, those who had excommunicated and deposed them: and, in that case, the Arian party, comprehending almost all the bishops of the church, must have prevailed. But as nothing was required of them, to keep their sees, besides their renouncing the confession of Rimini, which they had embraced, and embracing that of Nice, which they had renounced, they readily complied with the decree of the Council; insomuch that the following year, 363, Athanasius, in a letter, which he wrote to the emperor Jovian, immediately after the death of Julian, could assure that prince, that the faith of Nice had been received, and was professed, in all the provinces of the empire, which he enumerates; but omits those of Thrace, Bithynia, and the Hellespont,<sup>1</sup> the bishops there still continuing obstinately to maintain the doctrine of Arius, and to reject the faith of Nice, as we learn from Sozomen,<sup>2</sup> Socrates,<sup>3</sup> and Basil;<sup>4</sup> nay, at Constantinople, the orthodox had but a small chapel to assemble in, all the churches being in possession of the Arians, under Eudoxius, a leading man among the pure Arians, who had usurped that see.<sup>5</sup> For the better establishment of the orthodox faith, after the violent shock it had lately received, councils were held in several provinces of the empire,\* and by all was received the faith

of Nice, the confession of Rimini condemned, and the words *substance* and *consubstantial*. re-established.<sup>1</sup> A very strong proof that the assent given before to the Arian doctrines had been solely the effect of force, or of interest, which being now removed, and all left at liberty to act as their consciences only directed, the orthodox faith prevailed as much as the other had done under Constantius.

As every one was allowed by Julian to believe what he pleased, and to own his belief, whatever it was, the semi-Arians convened a council, soon after the death of Constantius, who, in the latter end of his life, had begun to persecute them as much as he had favored them before. This council was composed of those chiefly who had assisted at that of Seleucia, of which I have spoken above; and they all agreed to condemn and anathematize the doctrine of the pure Arians, with the confession of Rimini, and to sign anew the confession of Antioch, establishing a likeness in substance between the Son and the Father. Thus they pretended to keep a due mean between the two opposite extremes,

as the leading men of the Arian party. There is, among the fragments of St. Hilarius, a letter on this subject, from the Italian to the Illyrian bishops. Where this council was held I find no where recorded. In the year 363, the emperor Jovian desiring to be instructed in the faith of the catholic church, by Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops, who were come to wait on him, they assembled in council, and agreed to propose no other creed to him but that of Nice. At the same time they condemned the heresy of Macedonius, denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost. This council is generally thought to have been held at Alexandria. But, from the letter, which they presented to the emperor, it appears to have consisted of some Egyptian bishops, who, as it is there said, were appointed to represent all the others of the province. (a) Had the council been held in Alexandria, they had, I should think, been all present. It must therefore have assembled in some place out of Egypt; and where more likely than at Antioch? For there the emperor was this very year, and there Athanasius waited on him. The same year another council was held at Antioch, under Melecius bishop of that city. In that council, Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had been at the head of the Arian party, in the latter end of the reign of Constantius, and his followers, commonly styled Acacians, embraced the faith of Nice, and admitted the term consubstantial. Acacius had no other faith but that of the party which prevailed. Hence, in the time of Jovian, who favored the orthodox party, he professed the Faith of Nice; but two years after he had signed it, he joined the Arians anew, seeing them in great favor with the emperor Valens. Several other councils were held, from the year 363 to 368, of which we have no particular account. For Athanasius tells us, in general terms, that many councils assembled in France, in Spain, at Rome, in Dalmatia, in Dardania, in Macedonia, in Epirus, in Greece, in Candia, and the other islands, in Sicily, in Cyprus, in Lycia, in Isauria, in Egypt, and in Arabia; and that they all met to maintain the orthodox faith, the faith of the council of Nice. (b) In his letter to the emperor Jovian he assures him, that the symbol of Nice was received in the above-mentioned provinces, and besides, in Britain, in Africa, in Pamphylia, in Lybia, in Pontus, in Cappadocia, and in the east, that is, in the patriarchate of Antioch. (c) But in the provinces of Thrace, of Bithynia, and the Hellespont, the semi-Arians prevailed, till they were overpowered by the Arians, strongly supported by the emperor Valens, a most zealous defender of Arianism.

(a) Theod. l. 4. c. 3. (b) Athan. de Afr. and ad Epict.

(c) Id. ad Jov.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. ad Afr. p. 931. and ad Epict. p. 582.

<sup>1</sup> Atha. ad Jov. t. 1. p. 246. <sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 6. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Socr. l. 4. c. 1. <sup>4</sup> Bas. ep. 75. <sup>5</sup> Socr. ib.

\* The bishops of Gaul assembled at Paris in 362, and, having first owned their crime, in approving and signing the confession of Rimini, they acknowledged the three persons of the Trinity to be of the same nature and substance, and condemned Ursacius, Valens, and Auxentius the Arian bishop of Milan. This council was convened by St. Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers; and a letter, which the council wrote on this occasion, has been transmitted to us, among the fragments of his works. He is said to have assembled several other councils in Gaul, for the re-establishment of the faith of Nice, which is all we know of them. The same year, 362, the bishops of Italy assembling, declared void and null the acts of the council of Rimini, embraced the faith of Nice, and, with one accord, anathematized Ursacius and Valens,



The sect of the Macedonians. They are persecuted by the emperor Valens. Deliver to Liberius their confession of faith; who admits them to his communion. Liberius dies.

of the western bishops, whose consubstantiality, they said, left no room for the distinction of persons; and of the pure Arians, who denied all likeness.<sup>1</sup> It was after this council that the semi-Arians, separating themselves from the communion of the pure Arians, began to form a distinct sect, and to be called Macedonians; which name was given them from Macedonius, late bishop of Constantinople, but deposed by the pure Arians, in the council they held in that city in 360, to make room for their great champion Eudoxius, translated formerly from Germanicia to Antioch, and now from Antioch to Constantinople. They were also named Marathonians, from Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, who, together with Macedonius, was at the head of the party; and Pneumatomachi, that is, enemies to the Holy Ghost, whose divinity they denied, which was their chief, if not their only error; for some are of opinion, that though they rejected the word consubstantial, yet they agreed with the orthodox in the meaning of it. They led very regular, austere, and edifying lives; and are, on that score, highly commended and extolled by Gregory Nazianzen.<sup>2</sup> No wonder, therefore, that they soon spread all over the east, and gained every where great numbers of followers. At Constantinople, and in the neighbouring cities and provinces, they were followed not only by the greater part of the people, but by some persons of distinction, by such as were most remarkable for their piety, by entire monasteries, both of men and women.<sup>3</sup> The inhabitants of Cyzicus in the Propontis were almost all of this sect, and we are told of some miracles wrought by a Macedonian of that place,<sup>4</sup> which Baronius will not allow, though as well attested as any he relates.

The emperor Valens, who reigned in the east, which had been yielded to him by his brother Valentinian, when he took him for his colleague in the empire, spared no pains to reconcile this sect with that of the Arians, which he greatly favored. But, finding them no less averse to the Arians than the orthodox themselves, he began, in the year 366, to persecute them with great cruelty. To avoid this persecution they resolved to recur to the emperor Valentinian, and, embracing the faith professed by him and the western bishops, to put themselves under his protection. Accordingly he despatched three of their body, namely, Eustathius bishop of Sebaste, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala, to acquaint the emperor, in the name of the rest, with the resolution they had taken, and implore his protection.<sup>5</sup> These, being informed, on their arrival in Italy, that Valentinian was waging war with the barbarians on the borders of Gaul, instead of repairing to

him, which they apprehended might be attended with no small danger, went straight to Rome, and there delivered to Liberius letters from their brethren, directed to him, and to the other bishops of the west, whom they earnestly entreated to use their interest with the emperor, in their behalf, assuring them, that they sincerely renounced the errors they had hitherto held, and embraced the catholic faith, as explained and defined by the council of Nice.<sup>1</sup> But Liberius, notwithstanding these assurances, suspected their sincerity; and therefore could not, by any means, be prevailed upon to communicate with them, or even to hear them, till they had delivered to him a confession of faith, under their hand, and in the name of the whole party, wherein they anathematized those of Rimini, and Nice in Bithynia; condemned the heresy of Arius, with all other heresies; and received the definitions of the council of Nice, those particularly that related to consubstantiality. To this confession they added a solemn protestation, declaring themselves ready to submit to the sentence of such judges as the pope should think fit to appoint, should they, or those by whom they had been sent, be ever for the future accused or suspected of swerving in the least from the faith they now embraced and professed.<sup>2</sup> In virtue of this confession, whereof the original was carefully lodged in the archives of the church of Rome, Liberius admitted the deputies to his communion; and upon their departure, wrote, in the name of all the bishops of Italy, and the west, to the Macedonian bishops, of whom he names fifty-nine, signifying the great joy, which their letters, and the confession of faith, signed by their deputies, had occasioned at Rome, and in all the western churches, since by such a confession they were all again happily united in one faith. In this letter Liberius assures them, that all the bishops, who had assisted at the council of Rimini, had retracted the doctrine, which they had been forced to sign there; and were more than ever incensed against the Arians, on account of the violence, which, at their instigation, had been offered them.<sup>3</sup> The Macedonians admitted the divinity of the Son, but denied that of the Holy Ghost; nay, this was their favorite doctrine, and, as it were, the characteristic of their sect; but Liberius, and the other western bishops, not suspecting them of such an error, which in all likelihood they had not yet publicly owned, admitted them to their communion, without examining them on that head.

Liberius died soon after, that is, on the 23d or 24th of September, of the present year, 366, as we are told by Marcellinus and Faustinus, whose authority is preferable to that of any other, since, at this very time, they lived at Rome.<sup>4</sup> He had been chosen on the 22d of

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 5. c. 14.    <sup>2</sup> Greg. Naz. orat. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Ruf. l. 1. c. 25.    <sup>4</sup> Socr. l. 2. c. 45. l. 4. c. 4. l. 5. c. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Id. l. 4. c. 12.    Soz. l. 6. c. 10.

<sup>1</sup> Soz. Socr. ib.  
Basil. ep. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Socr. l. 4. c. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Marcell. and Faust. p. 4. 5.



The deplorable condition of the church in his time. By whom Arianism was banished out of the west. Neither Vincentius of Capua, nor Liberius, assisted at the council of Rimini. Liberius is honored as a saint. The founding of the church of St. Mary the Greater.

May, 352, so that he governed the church of Rome, fourteen years, four months, and a day or two. Liberius lived in troublesome times, the worst the church had ever yet seen. She had two dangerous enemies to contend with at the same time, the power of the prince then on the imperial throne, and the craft of a most subtle and deceitful party. The prince employed all his power to overcome, with oppression, those whom the party could not overreach with their craft; and the party to overreach with their craft such as the prince could not overcome with oppression. On the other hand, the prelates, even some who were reputed the pillars of the church, seemed to have lost that zeal, firmness, and intrepidity, which they had so gloriously exerted under the pagan princes, and few were found among them, whose virtue was proof against the loss of their dignity, or exile. Hence the defection became general, and the orthodox party was brought so low, that it must have been utterly quashed, had Constantius lived a few years longer. But Providence interposed; Constantius died while he was pursuing his scheme with the greatest success; and Julian, his successor, by betraying an equal hatred and aversion to Christians of all denominations, obliged them to forget their quarrels among themselves, to lay aside their animosity against each other, and to unite in their mutual defence against him, as a common enemy. Jovian, who succeeded him, proved no less favorable to the orthodox, than Constantius had been to the Arians. Many therefore of the latter, and among the rest Acacius, who was at the head of the pure Arians, to gain the favor of the emperor, publicly renounced the doctrine of Arius, and embraced that of Nice. Jovian, after a short reign of seven months and twenty days, was succeeded by Valentinian, who continued to countenance the orthodox, as his predecessor had done, though he did not use the Arians with that rigor which some zealots expected from a confessor, which title he had deserved under Julian. However, as he professed the orthodox faith, that party universally prevailed; insomuch that, in a very short time, no traces of Arianism were left in the west, except at Milan, under the Arian bishop, Auxentius, and in a few cities of Illyricum, where it was kept up by Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, and their disciples, till the following century, when it was every where re-established there by the Goths.

Baronius ascribes to Liberius the banishing of Arianism out of the west, and the establishing of the orthodox faith in its room; but that glory was owing, according to Ruffinus, to Hilarius of Poitiers, and Eusebius of Vercelli, who, like the two great luminaries of the universe, to use his words, enlightened with their rays Illyricum, Gaul, and Italy, dispelling every where the darkness of here-

sy.<sup>1</sup> He minutely describes the great success that attended them, with the difficulties and obstructions they met with in so pious and commendable an undertaking.<sup>2</sup> But, as for Liberius, he does not so much as mention him. And truly, from the year 357, in which he fell, to his admitting the Macedonians to his communion in 366, which was the last of his life, the only thing I find recorded of him in the ancients, is his writing a letter to the catholic bishops of Italy, wherein he exhorts them to atone for their past conduct by renouncing the errors of the Arians, and receiving anew the symbol of Nice. He adds, that as this is the only atonement, which it has been thought proper to require of them, they ought to exert their zeal against the authors of the fault they committed, in proportion to the grief they must feel for committing it.<sup>3</sup> This letter has been transmitted to us among the fragments of Hilarius. It is hard to guess what could induce Baronius to write so confidently as he does, that Vincentius of Capua assisted at the council of Rimini with the character of the pope's legate.<sup>4</sup> In what ancient author did he find the least intimation or distant hint of such a legation? Vincentius of Capua, though a person of great eminency, is not even mentioned by any of the contemporary writers, who relate the transactions of that council, and named the chief prelates who composed it. 'Tis true we read of him, in one author, that he never consented to the confession of Rimini:<sup>5</sup> but that is said of Liberius too,<sup>6</sup> whom Baronius owns not to have been present at that assembly.

Liberius, notwithstanding his fall, is honored both by the Latin and Greek churches as a saint. By the former his festival is kept on the 23d of September, and by the latter on the 27th of August.<sup>7</sup> He erected a church on the Esquiline mount at Rome, which bore his name, and was called the Basilic of Liberius, till it was consecrated to the Virgin Mary by Sixtus III. when it took the name of Sancta Maria Major, or Saint Mary the Greater. It owes its foundation, as is universally believed in the church of Rome, to the following miracle. A Roman of the patrician order, and of wealth equal to his rank, named John, having no children, resolved to make a free gift of his whole estate to the Virgin Mary. This resolution he imparted to his wife, who consenting to it with great alacrity, the estate was immediately made over to the holy Virgin, whom they thenceforth jointly intreated, in their daily prayers, to let them know by some token in what manner she chose to dispose of it. Their prayers were heard, and on the night preceding the 5th of August, when the heat is most violent at

<sup>1</sup> Ruf. l. 3. c. 30, 31.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Hil. frag. l. 1. p. 37, 38. <sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Theoph. l. 2. c. 13. <sup>6</sup> Id. ib. <sup>7</sup> Menæa, p. 293.



Writings falsely ascribed to him. Strange Conjectures of Baronius. Damasus a native of Rome.

Rome, a miraculous snow fell from heaven, which covered part of the Esquiline mount. The same night the patrician and his wife were admonished in a dream to build a church on the spot of ground which they should find covered with snow. Early next morning they went to acquaint Pope Liberius with what had happened, whom they found to have had the same dream; so that no room being now left to doubt of the revelation, the pope appointed a grand procession of the whole clergy, in which he walked himself, attended by crowds of people, to the above-mentioned mount; and there, having caused the snow, which still lay unmelted, to be removed, on the spot, which it had covered, he laid the foundation of that magnificent basilic, which was reared at the expense of the patrician, and is now known by the name of Saint Mary the Greater, and Saint Mary in the Snow.<sup>1</sup> I should not have thought such an idle tale worthy of a place in a grave history, were it not recorded in the most authentic book the church of Rome has after the scripture, the Roman Breviary, a book approved and commended by the council of Trent, and by the special bulls of three popes, Pius V. Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. of whom the latter declares every thing it contains to be extracted from ancient and approved authors, and to be agreeable to truth.<sup>2</sup> So that it would be less dangerous, at least in Italy, to deny any truth revealed in the scripture, than to question any fable related in the Breviary. The feast of the Snow, or St. Mary in the Snow, is kept annually at Rome, on the 5th of August, with the greatest solemnity. The college of cardinals assists that day at divine service in the church of Saint Mary the Greater; and the pope, if not indisposed, or otherwise prevented, officiates in person: the primicerio, or dean of that church, reads the account, which I have delivered above; and, that nothing may be wanting to complete the farce, numbers of children are employed, during the service, to drop jessamines from the gallery on the congregation, in remembrance and imitation of the miraculous snow. And truly by children alone such fables are proper to be acted and believed.

Several pieces have reached our times, which were either written by, or have been falsely ascribed to, Liberius. Among the former are, his letter in answer to the Macedonian bishops; another to the catholic bishops of Italy; which have been both mentioned above; and a discourse which he pro-

nounced on Christmas-day in the church of St. Peter, on occasion of his giving the sacred veil to Marcellina the sister of St. Ambrose when she embraced the state of virginity. This discourse St. Ambrose has inserted in his third book on virgins, but in his own style, which is very different from that of Liberius, who had not the gift of eloquence.<sup>1</sup> Among the pieces falsely ascribed to Liberius, most men of learning reckon the confession of faith, written in Greek, which he is supposed to have sent to Athanasius. This piece Baronius will, by all means, have to be genuine; and the use he makes of it is somewhat extraordinary. The council of Alexandria, to which the church owed her safety, was convened by Athanasius, upon his return from exile, as I have related above. By that small assembly, consisting only of confessors, was enacted the famous decree with respect to those, who had communicated with the Arians, and signed the confession of Rimini. To that decree the whole church readily conformed; so that the honor of saving the church was chiefly owing to Athanasius, and wholly to him and the other confessors. Of Liberius not the least mention is made; so that he had no share in that glory. The annalist therefore, not being able to bring in his sovereign pontiff upon the authority of any records now extant, has recourse to those that probably never were; or, if they ever were, are now no more. He supposes part of the above-mentioned confession of faith, sent by Liberius to Athanasius, to be wanting; and Liberius, in the part that is wanting, to have empowered Athanasius to convene a council, and to have appointed Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari, to assist at that council with the character of his legates. Such wild and extravagant suppositions require a very strong proof to support them, some plausible conjectures at least to give them an appearance of truth. But that we must not expect of Baronius. The only argument, if it may be so called, which he pretends to offer on this occasion, is, that he cannot conceive Athanasius, and the other holy confessors, would have taken upon them to act as they did, and enact a decree extending to the whole church, had they not received such a power from him, to whom all power was given,<sup>2</sup> meaning the pope. The other pieces, falsely ascribed to Liberius, are another letter to Athanasius, and one to all the catholic bishops; which are both reputed supposititious, being dated by consuls who never existed.

<sup>1</sup> Breviar. Rom. 5 Aug. <sup>2</sup> Vide Bull. Urb. VIII. Breviario prefix.

<sup>1</sup> Amb. de virg. l. 3. p. 437. <sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 306.



Damasus, a native of Rome, and deacon of that church. Whether he abandoned Liberius, and sided with Felix. He is chosen bishop of Rome, and likewise Ursinus.

## DAMASUS, THIRTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[VALENTINIAN, VALENS, GRATIAN, THEODOSIUS.]

[Year of Christ 366.] LIBERIUS was succeeded by Damasus, whom the Spanish writers, upon the authority of Anastasius, suppose to have been a native of Spain;<sup>1</sup> though there is no room to doubt of his being born in Rome, since it appears from an inscription quoted by Baronius,<sup>2</sup> that his father had been lector, deacon, and presbyter, of the church of St. Laurence in that city, and consequently must have lived there from his youth. Damasus had a sister named Irene, who embraced the state of virginity, and died before she was twenty, as we read in her epitaph.<sup>3</sup> It is not therefore probable, that her death happened in the twelfth year of her brother's pontificate, as the Spanish author of her life tells us, he being then seventy. Damasus served, as his father had done, the church of St. Laurence, till he was stricken in years; for he was upwards of sixty when raised to the episcopal dignity. He was deacon of Rome in 355, when Liberius was sent into exile; on which occasion he not only bound himself, with the rest of the clergy, by a solemn oath not to acknowledge any other bishop so long as Liberius lived, but attended him on his journey to the place of his banishment.<sup>4</sup> Marcellinus and Faustinus seem to insinuate, that soon afterwards, giving way to his ambition, he forgot the oath he had taken, abandoned Liberius, for whom he had professed the greatest friendship, and sided with Felix, his antagonist.<sup>5</sup> But these two presbyters were zealous partisans of the antipope Ursinus, of whom hereafter; and therefore we ought to be very cautious of what they write to the prejudice of Damasus. Jerom, who lived then at Rome, and in great intimacy with Damasus, reproaches such of the ecclesiastics as forsook Liberius, and joined Felix, with the breach of a most solemn oath; styles them perjurers, deserters, time-servers, &c., which I cannot think he would have done so freely, had Damasus been one of the number. I am therefore not a little surprised, that Baronius should blindly acquiesce to the accounts of the above-mentioned writers, and, without further inquiry, condemn Damasus as guilty of perjury, by ranking him among the followers of Felix.<sup>6</sup> And yet the annalist supposes him to have been appointed great vicar of Rome by Liberius, upon his withdrawing from the city to avoid the persecution

raised by Constantius after the council of Rimini:<sup>1</sup> so that, according to him, he must have changed sides anew, and, abandoning Felix, returned to Liberius, which is representing him as a man swayed by no other principles but those of interest and ambition, and therefore always siding with those who were uppermost. This is all we know of Damasus before his election.

Liberius dying on the 23d or 24th of September, 366, as I have related above, great disturbances were raised in Rome by the election of two bishops to succeed him, namely, Damasus and Ursinus, whom the later writers style Ursicinus, a deacon of that church. This double election gave rise to a dangerous schism, and a kind of civil war, within the walls of the city, which did not end without a great deal of bloodshed. I shall impartially relate what I find concerning this important transaction in the contemporary writers of either side, leaving the reader to judge which of the two pretenders was the cause of so much mischief, and which legally chosen. I shall begin with the account which Marcellinus and Faustinus, who were then at Rome, give us of these elections. They were both presbyters of that church, but, being strict followers of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, of whom I have spoken above, they and their whole party were deemed schismatics, and consequently cruelly persecuted by the catholic bishops, especially Damasus. Finding themselves thus oppressed, the two presbyters, between 383, and 388, drew up a petition in behalf of themselves and their afflicted brethren, addressed to Valentinian II. Theodosius, and Arcadius, intreating those princes to protect their innocence, and put a stop to the unbridled rage of their enemies. With this request the two presbyters repaired to Constantinople, being driven from Rome by Damasus, and there presented it to Theodosius, who, pitying their condition, in his rescript directed to Cynegius the Præfectus Prætorio, treated them as catholics, granted them the free exercise of their religion, and declared all those wicked men, nay, and heretics, who had presumed, or should for the future presume, to persecute or molest them.<sup>2</sup> In the preface, prefixed to this petition, I find the following account of both the above-mentioned elections. Ursinus, say they, was chosen in the basilic of Julius by the deacons Amantius and Lupus, and the people, who had

<sup>1</sup> Anast. c. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. 384. 16. in appar.

<sup>3</sup> Boll. 21 Feb. p. 244. ad annal.

<sup>4</sup> Marcell. & Faust. p. 3. <sup>5</sup> Id. p. 3—5.

<sup>6</sup> Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 60. & ad ann. 367. n. 8.

<sup>1</sup> Id. ad ann. 359. n. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 18.

100. 103. Gennad. c. 16.



Different accounts of these elections. Great disturbances in Rome, occasioned by this double election. Several persons massacred. The sedition becomes general.

continued in the communion of Liberius; but Damasus, by those who had adhered to Felix, assembled for that purpose in the church of St. Laurence, called in Lucinus. Ursinus was ordained the first, by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; which Damasus, who had always panted after the episcopal dignity, no sooner knew, than he hired a great number of chariot drivers, and other such despicable wretches, who, violently breaking into the basilic of Julius, massacred a great many people there. Seven days afterwards they made themselves masters of the Lateran basilic, and there was Damasus ordained bishop.<sup>1</sup> This account charges Damasus alone with the schism, and the evils attending it. On the other hand, the council of Rome, held about twelve years after, lays the whole blame on Ursinus, who, say they, boldly attempted to usurp a dignity, which on no score was due to him;<sup>2</sup> and that which met at Aquileia in 381, and consisted of all the most eminent bishops of the west, ascribes to Ursinus, and his temerity, the many calamities the church had suffered; paints him as a man of no credit, character, or reputation; and adds, that he seized by force what he had no hopes of attaining by lawful means.<sup>3</sup> Ambrose writes, that the suffrage of heaven concurred in the election of Damasus.<sup>4</sup> According to these authorities Damasus was lawfully elected, and Ursinus unlawfully. As to the particulars of his election, Jerom, who perhaps was then at Rome, tells us, that Damasus was first chosen, and then Ursinus, who, after his election, seized by force on the basilic of Sicinus,<sup>5</sup> that is, according to the most probable opinion, the basilic of Liberius, now St. Mary the Greater. Socrates says, that Ursinus having near as many votes as Damasus, he was thereby encouraged to hold separate assemblies, and to get himself ordained in a dark and retired corner of the basilic of Sicinus.<sup>6</sup> Ruffinus assures us, that Damasus was already ordained, when Ursinus, transported with rage, at his being preferred to him, assembled a great number of seditious people, and, supported by them, caused himself, in defiance of the canons of the church, to be ordained, in the basilic of Sicinus, by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; whereas the bishops of Rome were always ordained and consecrated by those of Ostia. After his consecration, continues this author, he ordained several persons; which was adding a sacrilege to his unlawful election.<sup>7</sup> Both Ruffinus, and Socrates, who follows him, were certainly mistaken as to the place of this ordination, since we are told by Marcellinus and Faustinus, that Ursinus was ordained, not in the basilic of Sicinus, but in that of Julius.<sup>8</sup> These two writers, who were in Rome at the time of the elections,

tell us, in express terms, that Ursinus was chosen before Damasus; and Jerom, who was probably in Rome at the same time, assures us in terms no less express, that Damasus was chosen before Ursinus. The former was greatly addicted to Ursinus, and the latter no less attached to Damasus. As for the two councils, which I have quoted above, they were held some years after, when the party of Damasus had universally prevailed, and it was a crime to acknowledge Ursinus. Jerom has been followed by most of the writers who came after, and the authority of the other two quite disregarded, for no other reason but because they were schismatics; for they joined Lucifer, as I have observed above, and refused to communicate with the bishops who had signed the confession of Rimini, nay, and with those who communicated with them.

By this double election the citizens of Rome saw themselves, before they were aware, involved in a civil war. The whole people were divided, some siding with Damasus, and some with Ursinus; and neither of the competitors showed the least inclination to yield to the other. No day passed without skirmishes and bloodshed; insomuch that Juventius, governor of the city, and Julian, the præfectus annonæ, to put a stop to the present, and prevent greater disturbances, agreed to banish Ursinus, whose party seemed less powerful, together with his two deacons, Amantius and Lupus. The two authors I have often quoted write, that both Juventius and Julian were bribed by Damasus, who taking advantage of the absence of his competitor, armed his followers with clubs and swords, hoping thus to intimidate the friends of the exiled bishop, and bring them in the end to acknowledge him. Seven presbyters of the party of Ursinus were seized, at the request of Damasus, in order to be sent into exile, but rescued by the people of the same party, and carried in triumph to the basilic of Liberius; which Damasus no sooner heard, than, arming all his followers, both clergy and laymen, with clubs, swords, axes, &c. he marched at the head of the seditious and enraged multitude to the basilic, which he and his partisans immediately invested, and attacked with the utmost fury. It was set on fire in several places; the doors were forced, the roof uncovered, and thence showers of tiles discharged on the people assembled there: great was the massacre; one hundred and sixty persons, men and women, were inhumanly murdered on the side of Ursinus, and a great many more wounded, some of whom died of their wounds. On the side of Damasus not one single person was killed. This riot began on the 25th of October, 366, at eight in the morning.

Thus the above mentioned writer.<sup>1</sup> Ruffinus writes in general terms, that the illegal

<sup>1</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 68, 69, 71.

<sup>4</sup> Amb. ep. 11. tom. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. chron.

<sup>6</sup> Socr. l. 4. c. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Ruff. l. 2. c. 10.

<sup>8</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 5 6.

<sup>1</sup> Id. p. 6, 7.



Damasus not easily cleared from all guilt. The luxury of the bishops of Rome.

election of Ursinus, in opposition to Damasus, occasioned such a tumult, or rather civil war, among the people, some siding with the one, and some with the other, that the places destined for prayer streamed with human blood.<sup>1</sup> The heathen Ammianus Marcellinus assures us, that the partisans of Damasus and Ursinus were so implacably incensed against each other, that several persons were wounded in the quarrel, and some killed: nay, it is certain, adds he, that in the basilic of Sicinus one hundred and thirty-seven persons were found dead, all killed the same day: but Damasus in the end, by the efforts of his party, got the better of his antagonist.<sup>2</sup> Jerom, however partial, owns, that Ursinus having got possession of the basilic of Sicinus, the partisans of Damasus repaired thither in crowds, and that several persons were thereupon inhumanly massacred.<sup>3</sup> The sedition became general, and the seditious on either side so numerous and powerful, that Juvenius, not thinking it advisable to punish, nor being able to appease, the enraged populace, abandoned the city and retired to the country.<sup>4</sup> He was perhaps for Ursinus, whose party being overmatched by that of Damasus, he might not think it safe to continue in Rome. Three days after the massacre in the basilic of Liberius, that is, on the 28th of October, the partisans of Ursinus, say Marcellinus and Faustinus, assembling, cried out aloud against Damasus, complaining of his conduct, and begging that a sufficient number of bishops might be convened, and the controversy referred to their judgment and decision.<sup>5</sup> Damasus was greatly favored, and chiefly supported, by the Roman ladies, which probably gave occasion to the charge of adultery that was brought against him. But Jerom, either to clear him of this charge, or to obviate the like suspicions, naturally arising from his familiar conversation with the female sex, styles him a "virgin doctor of the virgin church."<sup>6</sup>

Baronius, finding he can neither disguise nor extenuate the cruelty committed by those who adhered to Damasus, is at a great deal of trouble to disculpate him, and lay the whole blame on Maximinus, who, as appears from history, discharged the office of præfectus annonæ from the latter end of the year 367, to the beginning of 370, and was noted for his cruelty. Baronius is supported herein by the authority of Jerom and Ruffinus, of whom the former writes, that Damasus remained conqueror, without hurting the conquered;<sup>7</sup> and the latter, that the cruelties practised by the prefect Maximinus, who had espoused the cause of Damasus, upon those of the adverse party, rendered the name of that virtuous prelate odious, though he had no share in them.<sup>8</sup> But who is to be charged with the massacre

in the basilic of Sicinus or Liberius? On whom are the murders to be laid, committed there? Maximinus was not then in power, and perhaps not at Rome. I cannot help thinking but Damasus might at least have restrained his followers from such excesses; and consequently, as he did not, I cannot, with Ruffinus, conclude him to have had no share in them; I say, at least restrained; for I will not charge him with heading and encouraging the riotous multitude in that wicked attempt, upon the bare authority of Marcellinus and Faustinus, both zealous partisans of Ursinus. But neither ought Baronius, Bellarmine, Davidius, &c. upon the bare testimony of two writers, no less sanguine in the cause of Damasus, suppose him to have been no ways concerned in those disorders. The famous Ammianus Marcellinus, who lived at this very time in Rome, and, as a pagan, was no ways concerned in the quarrel, nor more inclined to one side than the other, assures us, that both were equally ambitious of the episcopal dignity, and both equally guilty.<sup>1</sup> The authority of a writer, thus unbiassed, and in every other respect unexceptionable, ought to be preferred, without the least hesitation, to that of any other, whom we have just reason to suspect of partiality. Jerom indeed speaks with more modesty and reserve than Ruffinus, and those who have copied after him; for he only says, that Damasus did not hurt his enemies after he had conquered them. But, in relating the above-mentioned massacre, and the skirmishes that happened before the party of Damasus prevailed, he always describes his partisans as the aggressors, without ever pretending to excuse him, as having no share in those riots; which he would not have failed to do, had he not paid a greater regard to truth than Ruffinus seems to have done.

The heathen Marcellinus, after telling us, that Damasus and Ursinus aspired with equal ambition to the episcopal chair, adds this famous remark, which I shall set down in his own words: "I must own," says he, "that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder, that those, who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments. But how happy would they be, if, despising the grandeur of the city, which they allege to excuse their luxury, they followed the example of some bishops in the provinces, who, by the temperance and frugality of their diet, the poverty and plainness of their dress, the modesty of their looks fixed on the ground, the

<sup>1</sup> Ruff. l. 2. c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Ammian. Mar. l. 27. p. 337.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. chron.

<sup>4</sup> Ammian. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. ep. 5. t. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Hier. ep. 49.

<sup>8</sup> Ruff. l. 2. c. 20.

<sup>1</sup> Ammian. l. 27. p. 337.



How the oblations of the faithful disposed of. Ursinus recalled by Valentinian; but banished anew. The bishop of Rome empowered by the emperor to judge other bishops.

purity of their lives, and the regularity of their whole conduct, approve themselves to the eternal God, and all his true worshippers!"<sup>1</sup> Thus Ammianus. And that Damasus was fond of all that pomp, grandeur, and parade, that he led such a voluptuous life, as Ammianus here so justly censures and condemns in the bishops of Rome, is not to be doubted, since Prætextatus, a man of the first quality, honored with the greatest employments of the empire, and zealously attached to paganism, in conversing familiarly with him, used pleasantly to say, "make me bishop of Rome, and I'll immediately turn Christian."<sup>2</sup> But, as I shall have occasion to speak of this subject hereafter, I shall only observe here, that the offerings of those devout women, and other pious Christians, were no better employed in the days of Damasus, than the immense wealth, which the church of Rome acquired in after-ages; by the voluntary contributions of all the Christian nations, is disposed of in ours. With these offerings the bishops of Rome used in more early times, to maintain the poor of their own church, and send the overplus to other churches, where the poor were numerous, and the offerings small. Of this generous practice I have mentioned some instances, that well deserve to be recorded. But when ambition began to take place of charity, the poor were forgotten, and nothing thought of but splendid equipages, numerous retinues, princely apparel, sumptuous tables, and whatever else could feed the vanity of these upstart princes, and put them upon the level with the greatest monarchs. To such purposes were the oblations of the faithful perverted. Baronius takes it very much amiss of Ammianus, that he should find fault with the costly tables and entertainments of the popes, since it is manifest from St. Austin, that the Christians at Rome, and, no doubt, the pope with the rest, kept a righteous fast three days in the week;<sup>3</sup> so that, in his opinion, they ought not to be blamed for rioting four days in the week, provided they fasted three. But to this doctrine Ammianus was a stranger, and therefore, notwithstanding the fasts they might keep, he justly censured their expensive tables and banquets as no ways suited to their profession and character.

But to return to Ursinus; he had been banished Rome by the prefect Juventius, before the 26th of October, 366, as I have related above; but the emperor Valentinian, who was at this time in Gaul, having, at the request of his friends, granted him leave to return, he entered the city on the 15th of September, 367, in a kind of triumph, being met and received with loud acclamations by those of his party.<sup>4</sup> At the same time the emperor directed a rescript to Prætextatus, who had succeeded Juventius in the prefecture of Rome, enjoining

him to recall all those, who had been banished for the late riots, and reinstate them in their former condition, after warning them, that if for the future, they disturbed the peace of the public, they should be punished without mercy.<sup>1</sup> But notwithstanding this warning, new disturbances must have happened, since Ursinus was, by an order from the emperor, banished again on the 16th of November of the same year, 367, together with seven of his followers, who were all confined to different places in Gaul, where they continued till the year 371.<sup>2</sup> The two presbyters tell us, that Damasus, having, with large sums, gained the ministers and favorites at court, by their means extorted from the emperor the above-mentioned order. They add, that the friends of Ursinus were resolved to stand by him; but that he, to prevent bloodshed, delivered himself up into the hands of the officers of justice.<sup>3</sup> However that be, by the banishment of Ursinus, and some of the leading men of his party, tranquillity was restored for a while, and the disturbances composed, says Ammianus, which the Christians had raised by quarreling among themselves.<sup>4</sup>

About this time the emperor Valentinian enacted a law, empowering the bishop of Rome to examine and judge other bishops, that religious and ecclesiastical disputes might not be decided by profane or secular judges, but by a pontiff of the same religion, and his colleagues.<sup>5</sup> A very imprudent law, considering the nature and consequences of such a concession. The bishops assembled in council at Rome, in 378, after declaring, in the strongest terms, their approbation of this law, agreed to present an address to the emperor Gratian, wherein they earnestly recommended to him the execution of it, because it greatly redounded, say they, to the honor of the sacred ministry; because the judgment of bishops was more sure and certain than that of any civil magistrate; and, lastly, because it delivered the prelates of the church from the just concern they were under, to find that they could not make their innocence appear without racks and tortures, which innocent persons were put to by the secular judges.<sup>6</sup> This exemption seems to have been understood by the council as extending to all cases, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Be that as it will, whatever exemption was by the above-mentioned law granted to the bishops, whatever power was by that law vested in the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues, the council, with a true sense of gratitude, acknowledged such power and immunity to be entirely owing to the indulgence of the emperor: a plain proof that the absurd and chimerical notion of a divine right was not yet broached. The bishops chose rather

<sup>1</sup> Idem ib. p. 337. 338.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 61. t. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ep. 86. Bar. ann. 367. n. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 6—9.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 9, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Idem ib.

<sup>4</sup> Ammian. l. 27. p. 349.

<sup>5</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80.

<sup>6</sup> Id. p. 81.



The followers of Ursinus driven out of Rome. Damasus assembles a council at Rome. Ursacius and Valens condemned. Auxentius, why spared.

to be judged by the pope and his colleagues, that is, by their own brethren, than by lay judges, for the reasons they allege in their address to Gratian. Hence they cheerfully submitted to his judgment, and applauded every new power that was granted him, as redounding to the honor of the episcopal order. But, alas! they were not aware, that every new power, yielded to the bishop of Rome, was a new link added to the chain they were forging, if not for themselves, for those, at least, who were to succeed them. They little apprehended, that the bishop of Rome would, in process of time, claim all the power vested in him, and his colleagues, as due to him alone, and that too by divine right; that, in virtue of such a claim, he would set up for universal and sole monarch of the church, exercise an unbounded authority and jurisdiction, and degrade all other bishops from his colleagues to his vassals and slaves. Blondel is of opinion, that the bishop of Rome was, by that law, only empowered to judge the bishops within the limits of his jurisdiction, that is, those of the suburbicarian provinces.<sup>1</sup> Others think that such a power was only for a time, and extended to those bishops alone who were concerned in the present schism; which seems most probable, since Valentinian declares, that he enacted the above-mentioned law to settle the church, shaken by the fury of the schism.<sup>2</sup>

Ursinus, and the leading men of his party, being driven out of the city, the inhabitants began to enjoy their former peace and tranquillity. But yet his followers continued to assemble in the cemeteries of the martyrs, and even kept possession of a church, supposed to be that of St. Agnes, without the walls.<sup>3</sup> Of this Damasus took care to transmit an account to the emperor, in a memorial; who, fearing that, from such a spark, the fire might break out again, which he had been striving to extinguish, enjoined Prætextatus to put Damasus forthwith in possession of that church; and, in the execution of this order, probably happened what we find related, perhaps with some exaggeration, by the two writers I have often quoted; for they tell us, that one day, while the followers of Ursinus were assembled, in great numbers, in the church of St. Agnes, Damasus, falling unexpectedly upon them with satellites, made a dreadful havock of the innocent and defenceless multitude.<sup>4</sup> After this second massacre Prætextatus, to secrete the tranquillity of the city, sent several more of the party of Ursinus into exile. Valentinian, however, would not consent to their being confined to any particular place; but gave them full liberty to live where they pleased, provided they kept out of Rome.<sup>5</sup> The two writers

add, that the cruelties exercised in the church of St. Agnes gave great offence to the bishops of Italy; and that Damasus having invited some of them to Rome, to solemnize with him the anniversary of his consecration, he laid hold of that opportunity to solicit them with intreaties, nay, and to tempt them with money, to condemn Ursinus; but all in vain; the bishops equally unmoved by his prayers and offers, refusing, with great firmness and resolution, to condemn a man whom they had not heard. Marcellinus and Faustinus close their preface with a short account of themselves, telling us, that the presbyters of Ursinus' party were imprisoned, racked, banished, dispersed, and sent into different countries; and that they themselves, who were of that number, presented a petition to the emperors, begging them to put a stop to so cruel a persecution.<sup>1</sup>

Damasus having thus, in the end, by the favor of the emperors, entirely got the better of the adverse party, and secured his dignity, he turned his thoughts to ecclesiastical matters. In the west there were now but three bishops, who still maintained the doctrine of Arius; namely, Arsacius, bishop of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, and Auxentius of Milan. Damasus, however, convened a numerous council at Rome; and there examined anew, and anew condemned the tenets of Arius, and all who held them, namely Ursacius and Valens.<sup>2</sup> Auxentius was a pure, and no less zealous, Arian, than either of these two; but as he was in favor with Valentinian, whom he had deceived by an equivocal confession of faith, Damasus, and his council, thought it advisable not to name him. The council wrote a synodal letter to the other bishops, acquainting them with what had passed; which was answered by Athanasius, and the bishops of Egypt, then assembled at Alexandria. In their answer they thanked Damasus for condemning Ursacius and Valens; but, at the same time, express no small surprise to find, that Auxentius was not yet deposed, though guilty not only of Arianism, but of many other crimes, which they enumerate.<sup>3</sup> Damasus and his colleagues paid, no doubt, great regard to the remonstrances of Athanasius; but, as Auxentius was supported by the emperor, and they were better courtiers than Athanasius, they never attempted to depose him; nay, they carried their complaisance so far as to condemn Ursacius and Valens, as if they had been the only Arian bishops in the west, without even naming Auxentius. He therefore kept, for many years, quiet possession of the see he had usurped, and was at last deprived of it by death alone.

The many abuses and disorders, that reigned at this time among the ecclesiastics

<sup>1</sup> Blond. Prim. p. 165. <sup>2</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 10. <sup>4</sup> Id. p. 10, 11.

Bar. ad ann. 368.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 11, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ath. ad Afr. p. 931.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib. p. 931—941.



The avarice of the Roman clergy restrained by Valentinian. Law enacted by him. The sentiments of St. Jerom and Ambrose concerning this law.

of Rome, offered a larger field to the zeal of Damascus, than the heresy of Arius, now confined in the west to a corner of Illyricum. But he was by no means a fit person to set up for a reformer of manners, and the evil required a more powerful remedy than he could apply. The prelates of the church, even the bishops of Rome, could yet only preach against vice, admonish the vicious, and inflict ecclesiastical censures on such as gave no ear to their admonitions: all other power was still lodged in lay hands, and only imparted to the ecclesiastics in some extraordinary cases. The insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, the mean and scandalous arts they were daily practising to circumvent the orphans, plunder the widows, and rob the lawful heirs of their just inheritance, cried loudly for a reform; but were evils too strong for the curb of exhortation, admonition, or censures merely ecclesiastical; and Damascus himself was not quite free from imputations of this nature. It was therefore necessary, that the secular power should interpose in defence of the deluded laity, against the craft and rapines of the ravenous clergy. A law was accordingly enacted by the emperor Valentinian, in the year 370, addressed to Damascus bishop of Rome, and read, on the 29th of July, in all the churches of that city, strictly forbidding the ecclesiastics, and such as professed celibacy, meaning the monks, to frequent the houses of orphans or widows, or to accept from those, whom they attended under the veil of religion, any thing whatsoever by way of donation, legacy, or feoffment in trust. Whatever was thus given or accepted, is declared forfeited to the public treasury.<sup>1</sup>

This law, taken in a literal sense, only forbids the ecclesiastics to accept such donations as were made by the women whom they attended in spiritual matters as their guides or directors; but it was either understood and interpreted as extending to all donations from pious persons, or a new law was made at this time excluding the ecclesiastics from all such donations, as plainly appears from Jerom and Ambrose, of whom the former, in one of his letters, writes thus: "I am ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols, the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates, and receiving legacies; from this common privilege, clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law; debarred, not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes."<sup>2</sup> And Ambrose; "We are excluded by laws, lately enacted, from all inheritances, donations and legacies: yet we do not complain: and why should we? By such laws we only lose wealth; and the loss of wealth is no loss to us. Estates are lawfully bequeathed to the ministers of the heathen temples; no layman is excluded, let his condition be ever so low, let his life be ever so scandal-

ous: clerks alone are debarred of a right common to the rest of mankind. Let a Christian widow bequeath her whole estate to a Pagan priest, her will is good in law; let her bequeath the least share of it to a minister of God, her will is null. I do not mention these things by way of complaint, but only to let the world know that I do not complain; for I had rather we should want money, than virtue or grace."<sup>1</sup> From these testimonies it is manifest, that either by the above-mentioned law, or by some other published at this time, the ecclesiastics were restrained from receiving any donations or legacies whatever, by whomsoever bequeathed: and that such a law was absolutely necessary, is no less manifest from the unquestionable authority of Jerom, who lived at this very time in Rome, and describes, as an eye-witness, the arts that were practised with great success, by the Roman clergy, to circumvent rich widows, and old men. "The clerks," says he, "who ought to instruct and awe the women with a grave and composed behavior, first kiss their heads, and then, stretching out their hand, as it were to bestow a blessing, slyly receive a fee for their salutation. The women in the mean time, elated with pride in seeing themselves thus courted by the clergy, prefer the freedom of widowhood to the subjection attending the state of matrimony. Some of the clergy make it the whole business and employment of their lives to learn the names of the ladies, to find out their habitations, to study their humor. One of these (perhaps Antimus or Sophronius, two monkish harpies, of whom he speaks elsewhere,) an adept in the art, rises with the sun, settles the order of his visits, acquaints himself with the shortest ways, and almost breaks into the rooms of the women before they are awake. If he sees any curious pieces of household furniture, he extols, admires, and handles it; and, sighing that he too should stand in need of such trifles, in the end, rather extorts it by force, than obtains it by good-will, the ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old fellow, that is always running about from house to house."<sup>2</sup> The same writer, speaking elsewhere of the monks, displays the arts which they practised to deceive, captivate, and plunder, the rich widows, and old men; and adds, that, by professing poverty, they were become rich, and that the church grieved to see many acquire great wealth by serving her, who had been beggars, while they lived in the world.<sup>3</sup> So that the monastic profession was in those early times what it is now, a gainful trade, under the mask of religion. As for the mean, nay, and nauseous offices, to which they were prompted by their avarice, and the greedy expectation of legacies, to submit, about the childless old men and women in their sickness, it would be forgetting

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. 16. t. 2. l. 20. p. 48. <sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 2. p. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Amb. ep. 12. t. 5. p. 200. <sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 22. <sup>3</sup> Id. ep. 3.



That law probably not procured by Damasus. It is extended to sacred virgins, and to bishops. The primitive rigor and discipline utterly neglected at Rome. The orthodox persecuted in the east.

the dignity of an historian to mention them. The reader will find them described by Jerom, and perhaps too minutely, in the letter he writ to his friend Nepotian.<sup>1</sup> In the same letter he informs us, how the wealth thus acquired was disposed of. "I," says he, applying to himself, what he levelled at others, to render the truth he spoke less disagreeable; "I, who was born in a poor country cottage, who had scarce millet enough, and coarse bread, to satiate my craving stomach, now despise the finest flour, the choicest honey, am well acquainted with the different kinds and names of fishes, and can tell by the taste from what coast each shell-fish was brought, from what province each bird."<sup>2</sup> A law was therefore necessary to restrain the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and obviate the unhallowed use they made of the wealth, which by such scandalous means they had acquired. This law Jerom calls a caustic; and adds, that he does not complain of it, but of the sore that required it.<sup>3</sup> However, that he complains, and Ambrose too, not only of the sore, but the caustic, is manifest from their words, and manner of writing. To exaggerate the pretended hardship, they both observe, that the pagan priests lay under no such restraints; an unseasonable observation! since it shows the difference between the pagan and Christian priesthood in a mortifying light. The former gave no occasion to such a law, their avarice wanted no such restraints: if it had, we may be sure they had met with no quarter from a Christian, nay, from an orthodox prince; and if he had spared them, such partiality had not been tamely put up, and passed over in silence, by the ecclesiastical writers of those times, namely, by the two I have mentioned.

Baronius is of opinion, that the above mentioned law was procured by Damasus, who, finding his clergy no longer awed by the spiritual sword, had recourse to the temporal; for the temporal, adds he, though in the emperor's hands, was given by our saviour to St. Peter and his successors, as well as the spiritual.<sup>4</sup> Thus he puts at once both swords into the pope's hands, though he has not yet been able to allege one single instance of their having either. They got both, it is true, in after ages; and we shall see, in the sequel of this history, how they came by them. But that law, says Baronius, was read in all the churches of Rome. And so have others been, when they concerned the clergy, and were addressed to, though not procured by, the bishop of that city.<sup>5</sup> Besides, as Damasus loved pomp and grandeur, it is not at all probable, that he was instrumental in the enacting of a law, which deprived him of the main fund to support them, the generosity of the Roman ladies.

Two years after, that is, in 372, the law I have mentioned above was extended by the same prince, namely, Valentinian, to the sacred virgins and bishops, so as to exclude the former from the right of giving, and the latter from that of receiving, any thing whatsoever by way of donation, legacy, &c.<sup>1</sup> But this law, with another still more severe, published twenty years afterwards by the emperor Theodosius, was abrogated by the emperor Marcian in the year 455, as I shall have occasion to relate hereafter. In the mean time I cannot help observing with astonishment, how early the primitive rigor of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome; how early the most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivalled, in riotous living, the greatest epicures of pagan Rome, when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerom, who was an eyewitness of what he wrote, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses, which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility, under the reign of Domitian. And how much more worthy were the former of the severest censure, not only in regard of their calling, and the religion they professed, teaching them to curb and subdue all irregular passions and appetites, but from this aggravating circumstance, that the estates they so squandered and wasted were not their own, but the patrimony of the poor, the substance of the orphans, widows, and unhappy persons, whom, under the cloak of religion, they robbed of their just inheritance! And herein they conformed to the example of their chief, who, finding an inexhaustible fund in the generosity of the Roman ladies to support his extravagance, lived in that pomp and grandeur which Ammianus has described above.

But he was roused from the easy and indolent life he led at Rome, by letters from the famous Basil, lately raised to the see of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the metropolis of Pontus, imploring his assistance, and that of the other western bishops, in the present unhappy condition of the churches in the east. Arianism was almost universally extirpated in the west under the orthodox emperor Valentinian, as I have observed above; but in the east it triumphed under his brother Valens, a most zealous favorer of the Arians, a most implacable enemy to the orthodox, who were by him every where driven from their sees, and sent into exile: nay, he gave full power to the Arian bishops and magistrates to imprison, fine, beat, rack, and banish, at pleasure, such of the orthodox clergy as they could not win over by more gentle methods. This power

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ep. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad. ann. 370. n. 118.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 50.

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. nov. 16. t. 2. l. 22. p. 50.



The orthodox inhumanly treated by the emperor Valens. They are divided among themselves. What occasioned this division. Meletius the new bishop of Antioch declares in favor of the orthodox. He is banished.

they used so tyrannically, especially at Constantinople, that the clergy of that city resolved to apply to Valens himself for relief, not doubting, but the miseries they groaned under might, if duly represented, even move him to compassion. Accordingly they appointed eighty of their body, all men of unblemished characters, and known piety, to repair to Nicomedia, where that prince then was, and lay their grievances before him. Upon their arrival at court, they were introduced to the emperor, who heard them with great attention, without showing the least emotion either of resentment or compassion. However, as, upon his dismissing them, he immediately sent for Modestus, the præfectus prætorio, they concluded that he had given ear to their just complaints, and began to expect a speedy redress of their grievances. But the charge he gave him, very different from what they expected, was to despatch them all without mercy or delay. The prefect, apprehending the death of so many eminent ecclesiastics might occasion a tumult in the city, gave out that the emperor had ordered them into exile; and accordingly caused them to be put on board a vessel, in order to be conveyed, as he pretended, to the place of their banishment. But the vessel was no sooner out of sight, than the mariners, pursuant to their private instructions, set fire to it, and betaking themselves to their boat, left those they had on board to the mercy of the flames and waves.<sup>1</sup>

But Athanasias, Basil, and the other champions of the orthodox party, were not so much alarmed at the cruel persecution raised against them by their enemies, as at the unhappy divisions that reigned at this very time among themselves. It was to procure a remedy for these divisions, to heal a dangerous schism, that rent the orthodox party into two opposite factions, that Basil, by the advice of Athanasius, writ the above-mentioned letter to Damasus, and that the orthodox bishops of the east writ in common a letter to all their brethren in the west. As this schism did more hurt to the orthodox cause than it was in the power of their enemies to have done, I shall not think it foreign to my purpose to insert a succinct account of its rise and progress. Eustathius, the orthodox bishop of Antioch, being deposed by the Arians in 331, and one of their own party put in his room, the greater part of the clergy and people of that city, acknowledging the new chosen bishop, and his Arian successors, assisted at their assemblies, mixed with the Arians, and received the sacraments at their hands, though they disagreed with them in belief. But some more zealous than the rest, refusing to own any other bishop so long as Eustathius lived, held their assemblies apart, under the direction of presbyters animated with the like zeal. These, from their steady attachment to Eustathius, were

called Eustathians, and with them alone Athanasius communicated while he was at Antioch.<sup>1</sup> This schism or separation continued even after the death of Eustathius, those of his party declining not only the communion of the Arians and their bishops, but of the orthodox, who communicated with them. In the year 360, the see of Antioch being vacant, by the translation of Eudoxius the Arian to that of Constantinople, the Arians, and the orthodox, who communicated with them, chose with one consent the famous Meletius to succeed him. Both parties joyfully concurred in this election; the orthodox, because they knew his doctrine to be no less pure than his manners; and the Arians, because they hoped, by such a distinguishing mark of their friendship and esteem, to win him, and by his means to gain over to their party the whole city of Antioch, nay, and the Eustathians themselves.<sup>2</sup> But they soon found, to their great mortification, that the orthodox were better acquainted with Meletius than they, that he was most zealously attached to the orthodox party, and was not to be swayed by friendship or enmity, by hopes or terrors. He was no sooner installed, which ceremony was performed with the greatest solemnity, than he loudly declared in favor of consubstantiality, and boldly cut off from his communion, as rotten and incurable members, all who held the opposite doctrine. The Arians of Antioch were thunderstruck with the boldness of the attempt; the whole party took the alarm; Eudoxius bishop of Constantinople, and the neighboring bishops, forgetful of every thing else, hastened to Antioch; hopes, fears, prayers, menaces, were successively employed, and nothing left unattempted to divert, at least to allay, the impending storm. But all in vain; the zeal of Meletius was incapable of control: he openly declared, that nothing should, nothing could, make him desist from, or relent in, the work he had undertaken, till he had utterly extirpated the Arian heresy, without leaving the least shoot of so poisonous a weed in the field, which by divine appointment he was to guard and cultivate.<sup>3</sup> The Arians finding him immovably fixed in his resolution, and, what doubled their concern, the whole party in imminent danger from one of their own choosing, they applied with better success to the emperor Constantius; and, charging the new bishop of Antioch with Sabellianism, which charge the credulous and unwary prince believed upon their word, they extorted from him a rescript banishing Meletius from Antioch about thirty days after his instalment, and confining him to Melitene in Armenia, his native city.<sup>4</sup> Euzoius was preferred in his room, formerly the chief favorite of Arius, and the most ancient

<sup>1</sup> Socr. l. 4. c. 15. Soz. l. 6. c. 13. Theod. l. 4. c. 21. Naz. or. 20.

<sup>1</sup> Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Theod. l. 2. c. 27. ep. 73. c. 28. Hier. chron. <sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 4. c. 28. <sup>3</sup> Chrys. or. 45.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. ib. Epiph. c. 38. Soz. l. 4. c. 28. Theod. l. 2. c. 27. Philost. l. 5. c. 5.



Great divisions in that church. The council of Alexandria strive to heal these divisions. All means of an accommodation cut off by the imprudent conduct of the bishop of Cagliari.

of all his disciples; for together with him he was condemned by the great council of Nice.

The orthodox, who had hitherto communicated with the Arians, were so disobliged and scandalized at these proceedings, that, in the end they renounced the Arian communion; and, assembling by themselves, proposed a union with the Eustathians. But their proposal was rejected by the leading men of that party, alleging, that they could not admit them to their communion, because they had for so many years communicated with the Arians, received the sacraments at their hands, and still seemed to acknowledge Meletius as lawful bishop, though he had been chosen by the Arian faction: for the Eustathians, notwithstanding the heroic firmness of Meletius in defending and promoting the common cause, refused to own him, for no other reason but because the Arians had had a chief share in his election.<sup>1</sup> As this disagreement greatly weakened the orthodox cause in Antioch, and might, in time, be attended with fatal consequences, no pains were spared by the apostolic men of those times, to induce the Eustathians to abate somewhat of their zeal and severity. As for the other party, notwithstanding their attachment to Meletius, whence they had the name of Meletians, they were greatly inclined to an accommodation, and seemed to court the communion of the Eustathians, almost upon any terms. Lucifer, the famous bishop of Cagliari, on his return from Thebais in Egypt, to which place he had been confined by Constantius, was prompted by his zeal to take Antioch in his way, with a design to mediate an accommodation between the dissenting parties. Being arrived in that city, he had several conferences with the leading men of the one and the other party; and, finding neither averse to an accommodation, he conceived great hopes of succeeding in his design; and therefore begged the fathers of the council of Alexandria, which was already sitting, and to which he had been invited by Athanasius, to dispense with his assisting at that assembly, since his presence seemed more necessary at Antioch. However, he appointed two of his deacons to be present as his deputies, enjoining them to agree, in his name, to the decisions of the council.<sup>2</sup> Baronius owns here, which I cannot help observing by the way, that Lucifer never appeared in the council of Alexandria;<sup>3</sup> forgetting, no doubt, what he elsewhere so strenuously maintains;<sup>4</sup> namely, that Lucifer assisted at that assembly, in the name of pope Liberius, and as his legate.

The fathers of the council not only approved of the bishop of Cagliari's resolution, but appointed Eusebius of Vercelli, and Asterius of Petra in Arabia, to assist him in so pious an undertaking. What seemed chiefly to ob-

struct the so much wished for union, was a great attachment on one side to Meletius, and an equal obstinacy on the other, in refusing to acknowledge one preferred by the Arians. The confessors therefore assembled in Alexandria (for of confessors alone that assembly was composed) were of opinion, that, if every other remedy proved ineffectual, their deputies should apply to Meletius; and, having persuaded him to resign his dignity, choose another in his room, equally acceptable to both parties. They did not in the least doubt but Meletius would readily, nay, with great joy, sacrifice his dignity, and every other private view, to the public tranquillity;<sup>1</sup> so great was the opinion they entertained of his virtue. Had this wise resolution taken place, it had, in all likelihood, been attended with the desired effect. But before the deputies could reach Antioch, Lucifer, more commendable for zeal than prudence, had cut off all means of an accommodation, by conferring, of his own authority, the episcopal dignity on the presbyter Paulinus, who was at the head of the Eustathians, and had with more warmth than any other opposed Meletius, and those who adhered to him. He was assisted in that irregular ordination by two other confessors;<sup>2</sup> namely, Gorgonius of Germanicia, and Cymatius of Gabala, or rather of Paltos.<sup>3</sup> This step he took to oblige the Eustathians, when he found they could by no means be induced to acknowledge Meletius. But, instead of closing, he thereby widened, the breach, the Meletians declaring, that they would never abandon a bishop of their own party, to acknowledge one of another, chosen without their consent, or even their knowledge.<sup>4</sup> This unhappy division, thus settled and confirmed between the two orthodox parties in Antioch, did not continue long confined to that particular church, but soon extended to the church universal; some owning Meletius for lawful bishop of Antioch, and others Paulinus. Athanasius communicated with Paulinus, and not with Meletius; and his example was followed by the bishops of Egypt, of Cyprus, and all the bishops in the west.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, all the orthodox bishops in the east, except Athanasius, and those I have mentioned, espoused, with great warmth, the cause of Meletius.<sup>6</sup> They all continued, however, notwithstanding this disagreement, to communicate with each other, though with some indifference and coldness. The ordination of Paulinus gave rise to another schism; for Eusebius of Vercelli, finding, on his arrival at Antioch, all hopes of an accommodation cut off, and no room left for the measures concerted and agreed to by the council, immediately quitted the city, without communicating with either party. This was

<sup>1</sup> Socr. 1. 2. c. 44. Theod. 1. 3. c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Ruf. 1. 1. c. 20. Socr. 1. 3. c. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 180.

<sup>4</sup> Id. ib. n. 206.

<sup>1</sup> Athan. de Ant. p. 574—577.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. chron.

<sup>3</sup> Ath. ep. ad Solit. & de Antioch. Eccl. p. 580.

<sup>4</sup> Ruf. 1. 1. c. 27. Theod. 1. 3. c. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Id. ib. c. 30.

<sup>6</sup> Id. ib.



St. Basil, bishop of Cæsarea applies to Damasus. The haughty conduct of Damasus resented by St. Basil. St. Basil complains of Damasus, and the western bishops. Damasus takes on him the office of judge, being only chosen mediator.

condemning the conduct of Lucifer; which he could not brook; and therefore, full of resentment, he renounced the communion of Eusebius, with whom he had hitherto lived in the greatest intimacy, and suffered together with him a most painful exile for the common cause.<sup>1</sup>

Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, one of the great lights of the church, left nothing unattempted, which he apprehended could any ways contribute to the reuniting of the orthodox among themselves, and putting an end to the present schism. But, despairing at last of success, and finding the prelates in the east all warmly engaged in the dispute, some in favor of Meletius, and some of Paulinus, he resolved to apply to the bishop of Rome, who had not yet declared for either of the competitors, his thoughts being wholly employed in securing his dignity against a competitor at home. He wrote therefore to Damasus, entreating him to despatch deputies into the east, who, in concert with the prelates there, inclined to an accommodation, might settle the proper means of accomplishing so desirable a work, and uniting in charity those, who were already united in faith. He added, that it was from his zeal alone they expected relief, from that zeal which he had made so eminently appear on other occasions; that Dionysius, one of his predecessors, had afforded them a seasonable assistance, when their wants were less pressing, and their condition not so deplorable; and therefore that there was no room left to doubt of his readily conforming to so glorious an example.<sup>2</sup> With this letter, and another from the bishops in the east, soliciting the advice, assistance, and mediation of their colleagues in the west, Dorotheus, deacon of the church of Antioch, was despatched into Italy: whence he returned in the beginning of the following year, 372, with an answer from the bishops of Illyricum, Italy, and Gaul.<sup>3</sup> But Damasus did not condescend to return an answer to Basil, or take the least notice of his letter; which haughty conduct he justly resented, and in pretty sharp terms, taxing Damasus, in one of his letters,<sup>4</sup> with a spirit of pride and vanity, which made him overlook other bishops as below his attention, and expect to be accosted by them with the meanest flattery. But his thus disregarding the request and entreaties of the bishop of Cæsarea, was not owing to his pride alone. He was so little acquainted with the state of the churches in the east, and what passed there, that he looked upon Eusebius, bishop of Samosata, and Meletius, with whom Basil lived in great intimacy, as rank Arians, though they both lived at that very time in exile, having been driven from their sees by the Arians, on account of the zeal, which they had, with an

invincible firmness, exerted in defence of the orthodox faith.<sup>1</sup> The bishop of Rome might, with very little trouble, have been better informed; but his mind, it seems, was so deeply engaged in worldly affairs, and his thoughts so taken up with state, pomp, and grandeur, that he was never at leisure to mind those matters, which justly claimed, and ought to have engrossed, his whole attention. By him the western bishops were led into the same mistake concerning Eusebius and Meletius; and hence the backwardness they showed to correspond with Basil, as if he designed to impose upon them, or was himself imposed upon by others. Of this Basil justly complained in a letter he writ to Eusebius of Samosata. "If the wrath of God," says he, "is in the end appeased, if mercy takes place, what other help do we stand in need of? But, if his anger continues, what relief will the pride of the west afford us? They neither know the truth, nor can they patiently bear it. They are ever prepossessed with idle jealousies, ever swayed by groundless surmises; and therefore act now the same part they lately acted in the case of Marcellinus; that is, they quarrel with those, who inform them of the truth, and, being left to themselves, they introduce and establish heresies. As for my own part, I had once some thoughts of writing a private letter to their chief (that is, to Damasus), and, waving all mention of church affairs, only tell him, that they neither know what passes here, nor take the right method to be informed; and that they ought not to oppress those who are already humbled by affliction, nor mistake pride for dignity, since that sin alone is capable of setting a man at enmity with God."<sup>2</sup> From these words it is pretty plain that the notion of the pope's infallibility was not yet broached, or at least was not yet known to Basil. The bishop of the metropolis of the empire was deservedly looked upon, in regard of the dignity of his see, as the chief and head of all the western bishops; and to him as such, not as an infallible and unerring judge, the eastern bishops frequently applied in the disputes, that happened to rise among them; so that all we can infer from their applying to him is, that his authority bore a great sway; which was owing to the pre-eminence of his see, and not to any power or prerogative peculiar to him, and superior to others.

It was long ere Damasus could be brought to give any attention to the affairs of the east; and when he did, it was only to add fuel to the fire, which had lately begun to rage with great violence. For, looking upon the office of a bare mediator, which alone had been offered him, as no ways suitable to his dignity, he arrogantly assumed that of a judge, and not only acknowledged Paulinus for lawful bishop of Antioch, but, misled by

<sup>1</sup> Id. ib. Theod. l. 3. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. ep. 320.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ep. 2. 73.

<sup>4</sup> Id. ep. 250.

<sup>1</sup> Id. ep. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ep. 8.



His conduct condemned by St. Basil. New disturbances raised in Rome, by the partisans of Ursinus; who are banished. The Luciferians persecuted by Damasus. Apollinaris the heresiarch. An account of him.

false and groundless reports, declared Meletius a transgressor of the canons, an intruder, a schismatic, and even a heretic;<sup>1</sup> that Meletius, who had suffered exile, and innumerable hardships, in defence of the orthodox faith, who was then revered all over the east, as a man of extraordinary sanctity, and is now honored by the church of Rome as a saint of the first class. But his thus openly declaring in favor of Paulinus, his treating in such a base and unworthy manner one of the most eminent prelates of the east, served only to engage the followers of Meletius more warmly in his cause; and the great Basil, among the rest, who could not help censuring the conduct of Damasus as rash, partial, and injudicious: he even repented his having ever applied to him; for, in one of his letters to Eusebius of Samosata, he expresses himself thus: "The saying of Diomedes occurs to my mind; entreaties are not to be used with Achilles, he is too haughty;<sup>2</sup> and truly the more you flatter haughty and insolent men, the more haughty and insolent they become."<sup>3</sup> As no regard was had to the authority of Damasus, and the western bishops, who, following his example, acknowledged Paulinus, and not Meletius, the orthodox bishops in the east not only continued divided among themselves, but a new division arose between the western bishops, and those of the party of Meletius, at the head of which was Basil, bishop of Cæsarea. But, of these unhappy divisions, so far as the bishops of Rome were concerned in them, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Damasus was far more successful in suppressing the schism of Ursinus, which about this time was revived at Rome. The emperor Valentinian, some time before, by a rescript addressed to Ampelius, governor, and Maximinus, vicar of Rome, had allowed Ursinus, and the leading men of his party, who had been confined with him to Gaul, liberty to live where they pleased, provided they kept out of Rome, and the suburbicarian provinces.<sup>4</sup> This indulgence shown by the emperor to Ursinus, encouraged his followers in Rome to declare openly in his favor, and even to assemble apart from those who communicated with Damasus. But, being therein opposed by the party of Damasus with their usual violence, new disturbances arose, and the city was upon the point of becoming again the scene of a civil war. Simplicius, then vicar of Rome, at the request of Damasus, gave the emperor immediate notice of the approaching danger; and the emperor, in answer to his letter, sent him a rescript, commanding "all those who, in contempt of religion, held or frequented unlawful assemblies, to be banished one hundred miles from Rome, that their obstinacy might hurt none but themselves."<sup>5</sup> Thus for the present a

stop was put to the disorders that began to reign in the city.

The two presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, pretend, that this law was levelled at the Ursinians alone, but was interpreted by Damasus, as comprehending the Luciferians, as the followers of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, who, refusing to communicate with the bishops who signed the confession of Rimini, and with all who communicated with them, had separate assemblies at Rome, and even a bishop of their own, named Aurelius. But Damasus, say they, using them, in virtue of the above-mentioned law, with no less cruelty than he did the Ursinians, they thenceforth assembled only in the night, under a presbyter, named Macarius, of whose sanctity and austerities they relate wonderful things. But night and darkness could not protect them against the persecuting spirit of Damasus, whose clerks, breaking one night in upon them, while they were performing divine service in a private house, dispersed the congregation, seized Macarius, and dragging him along with them over the sharp flints, by which he was cruelly bruised, and dangerously wounded in the thigh, they kept him the remaining part of the night closely confined. Next morning he was carried before the judge, who, finding him inflexible in rejecting the communion of Damasus, condemned him to exile; but the holy presbyter, being arrived at Ostia, died there of his wounds.<sup>1</sup> The same authors add, that Damasus caused several catholic presbyters to be sent into exile, and some laymen; but that Aurelius, the Luciferian bishop, in spite of all his efforts, continued in Rome to the hour of his death.<sup>2</sup>

About this time, that is, in the year 377, a great council was held at Rome, in which the famous Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, was condemned and deposed with his two disciples, Vitalis and Timotheus. Apollinaris was a man of uncommon parts, great penetration, universal knowledge; and had at first been so zealous a defender of the orthodox faith, that he was looked upon by all, particularly by Epiphanius and Athanasius, as one of the great champions of that cause,<sup>3</sup> and ranked by Philostorgius with Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen.<sup>4</sup> He contracted a strict friendship with Athanasius, when that prelate passed through Laodicea in 349, on his return to Egypt, and ever after maintained a close correspondence with him, on which account he was excommunicated by Gregory, the Arian bishop of that city.<sup>5</sup> When the Arians began to prevail in the east, Apollinaris was cruelly persecuted by the men in power of that party, and at last driven into exile.<sup>6</sup> Basil writ several letters to him, and

<sup>1</sup> Id. ep. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Hom. II. 9. ver. 694.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. ep. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Cod. Theod. 9. t. 29. l. 1. p. 221.

<sup>5</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 91.

<sup>1</sup> Marc. & Faust. p. 65—67. <sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 24. Hier. vir. ill. c. 104.

<sup>4</sup> Suidas, p. 273.

<sup>5</sup> Soz. l. 6. c. 35.

<sup>6</sup> Nil. l. 1. ep. 257.



The doctrine held by Apollinaris, and his disciples. Apollinaris not known nor suspected to be the author of the heresy he broached.

in those he wrote to others, often mentions him as a person for whom he had the greatest esteem.<sup>1</sup> He is said to have excelled in the knowledge of the scriptures, which he publicly interpreted at Antioch, where he had Jerom among the many disciples, who flocked from all parts to hear him.<sup>2</sup> But he was equally versed in human learning, especially in poetry; and his knowledge in that branch of literature proved very useful in the time of the emperor Julian. For that prince having by a law debarred the Christians from perusing or studying the pagan authors, Apollinaris, to supply the want of those writers, composed several pieces in imitation of them, and, among the rest, a poem comprising the history of the Jews to the time of Saul, and divided into twenty-four books, which he distinguished by so many letters of the Greek alphabet, as Homer had done.<sup>3</sup> He likewise wrote comedies, tragedies, lyric verses, &c. imitating Pindar in the latter, and Menander and Euripedes in the two former.<sup>4</sup> Sozomen thinks his compositions fell in no respect short of the works of the ancients; who, upon the whole, says he, were far inferior to him, since they excelled, each in one kind only, but he equally in all.<sup>5</sup> The tragedy entitled, "Christ Suffering," which is to be found among the works of Gregory Nazianzen, is by some ascribed to Apollinaris; but that piece does not at all answer the great opinion Sozomen seems to have entertained of him. His paraphrase in hexameter verse on the Psalms, the only entire work of his that has reached our times, is an elegant, exact, and sublime translation of them, greatly commended and admired by the best judges.<sup>6</sup> His poetry proved very serviceable to him, when he began to broach his heresy; for great numbers of people, especially women, embraced his doctrine, being taken, and in a manner enchanted, with the sweetness of his verses; for he composed a great many songs and odes equally pious and elegant, adapted to all occasions, and on all occasions sung with suitable airs by his followers.<sup>7</sup> To these Gregory Nazianzen no doubt alludes, where he speaks of the Psalms of the Apollinarists, to which the Psalms of David had given place; of those sweet and so much admired verses, which were looked upon by them as a third testament.<sup>8</sup> It was chiefly to oppose the progress Apollinaris made, by the insinuating means of his poetry, that Gregory Nazianzen applied himself to the same study. About the year 362, Apollinaris was raised, in consideration of his great piety and learning, to the see of Laodicea in Syria, in which city he was born, according to the most probable opinion, and had spent the greater part of his life.

As for the doctrine held by Apollinaris, and his followers, called from him Apollinarists; they maintained at first, that Christ had human flesh, but not a human soul, the want of which was supplied, according to them, by the divinity. But being afterwards convinced, that such a doctrine was repugnant to several plain and express passages of scripture, they abandoned it in part, and, distinguishing, with some philosophers, the soul, by which we live, from the intelligence, by which we reason, they allowed the former in our Saviour, but denied the latter; the operations of which, said they, were performed by the divinity.<sup>1</sup> Thus they allowed him, says St. Austin, the soul of a beast, but denied him that of a man.<sup>2</sup> By means of this doctrine they avoided the absurdity with which they reproached the catholics, admitting in Christ, as they falsely imagined, two opposite and distinct natures, without any union or subordination between them.<sup>3</sup> The catholics indeed acknowledged two distinct and complete natures in Christ; but at the same time maintained a union between them, such a union as was admitted by the Apollinarists between the flesh and the Divinity. The latter upbraided the catholics with adoring a man, styling them Anthropolaters; and the catholics reproached in their turn the Apollinarists with adoring the flesh, calling them Sarcolaters.<sup>4</sup> The Apollinarists distinguished themselves from the catholics, by causing the following words to be fixed on the front of their houses; "We must not adore a man that bears a God, but a God that bears flesh." The errors of the Apollinarists were not only concerning the soul, but likewise the body of our Saviour; for they maintained, that his body, like other bodies only in appearance, was coeval with the Divinity, and of the same substance with the eternal wisdom.<sup>5</sup> Hence it followed, by a natural consequence, that the body of our Saviour was impassible and immortal; that it was not taken of the Virgin Mary; that he was not born of her; that his birth, passion, death, and resurrection, were mere illusions; or else that the Divine nature was passible: both which absurdities were admitted by some of the sects into which the Apollinarists were afterwards divided.<sup>6</sup>

This doctrine was first heard of in 362, and condemned the same year in the council of Alexandria. In 373, it began to make a great noise in the church; but it was not known even then by whom it had been broached: for Apollinaris was so far from owning himself the author of those tenets, that, in one of his letters to Serapion bishop of Thmuis in

<sup>1</sup> Basil. ep. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 65.

<sup>3</sup> Soz. l. 5. c. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>6</sup> Voss. poet. Græc. c. 9. p. 76. Baillet, t. 6. p. 453. 455.

<sup>7</sup> Soz. l. 6. c. 25.

<sup>8</sup> Naz. or. 52. p. 745.

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. 77. c. 23. Theod. <sup>2</sup> Aug. in. Jo. hom. 47.

hær. 4. c. 8. Ath. de incar. <sup>3</sup> Naz. or. 52. p. 749.

p. 615. Nem. l. 1. p. 710. <sup>4</sup> Nys. in Apol. l. 2. p. 47.

Naz. orat. 46. p. 722. Naz. car. 146.

<sup>5</sup> Athan. ad Epiph. 582. <sup>6</sup> Ath. ib. p. 583. Naz. Aug. pers. c. 24. & hær. or. 46. Nil. l. 1. ep. 55. Theod. l. 5, c. 3. Naz. 257. Theod. l. 5. c. 3. or. 51.



His errors condemned in a council at Rome. Damasus imposed upon by Vitalis, one of his disciples. Apollinaris openly declares against the church.

Egypt, which is still extant,<sup>1</sup> he expresses, in the strongest terms, his approbation of a letter from Athanasius to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, confuting the very errors he held; and at the same time condemns the folly of those, who maintained the flesh to be consubstantial to the divine nature. In another letter to the same Serapion, he owns the body of our Saviour to have been taken of the Virgin Mary, to have been formed in her womb, and his flesh to have been of the same substance with ours; adding, "And these are truths not to be called in question."<sup>2</sup> In a third letter he assures Serapion, that he has ever denied in his writings the flesh of our Saviour to have descended from heaven, or to be of the same substance with the Divinity.<sup>3</sup> Apollinaris, by thus publicly declaring against the doctrine, which at the same time he was privately propagating, eluded the vigilance of Athanasius himself, who, in confuting his errors, never mentions his name, nor seems to have entertained the least suspicion of him; nay, he recommended Timotheus, a favorite disciple of his, to Damasus, as a person whose orthodoxy was not to be questioned; and as such he was received, not only by the bishop of Rome, but by all the western bishops, of whom he obtained letters, on his return, directed to Apollinaris, as to a bishop of the catholic communion.<sup>4</sup>

In the year 374 or 375, Damasus convened a great council at Rome, in which the errors of Apollinaris were condemned; but neither was he nor any other named as the broacher or author of that doctrine. The very year that Damasus condemned the doctrine of Apollinaris, he was deceived and overreached by one of the disciples of that heresiarch, named Vitalis. He was a presbyter of the church of Antioch, and of the communion of Meletius, by whom he had been ordained; but afterwards, renouncing his communion, he joined Apollinaris, and, being in high esteem with the people, drew great numbers over with him to that side. Of these, called from him Vitalians, Apollinaris some years after appointed him bishop, adding thereby a fourth party to the three that already divided the church of Antioch, namely, the Arians, Paulinians, and Meletians.<sup>5</sup> Before he threw off the mask, and publicly maintained the tenets of Apollinaris, he strove to be admitted with his followers to the communion of Paulinus of Antioch, and of Damasus; and with this view he undertook a journey to Rome in the year 375. As he had been suspected, and even accused of holding the doctrines of Apollinaris, Damasus required of him, before he admitted him to his communion, a confession of his faith, which he gave under his hand, but in such terms as bore a double meaning. Damasus, however, well satisfied with it,

gave him a letter for Paulinus of Antioch, and sent him back to be admitted by that bishop to the communion of the church.<sup>1</sup> But Damasus soon after, either upon his own reflection, or at the suggestion of others, apprehending himself imposed upon, wrote another letter to Paulinus, by the presbyter Patronius, and afterwards a third, which Holstenius has inserted at length in his "Roman Collection."<sup>2</sup> Together with this letter Damasus sent to Paulinus a confession of faith, drawn up by a council summoned for that purpose, desiring him to admit none to his communion, but such as should sign that confession, and the confession of Nice.<sup>3</sup> To this piece the fathers of the council of Chalcedon no doubt allude, in commending Damasus for pointing out, in his letters to Paulinus, the rules all catholics ought to be guided by in reasoning of the mystery of the incarnation.<sup>4</sup> What Baronius observes here is true, namely, that Vitalis, by the same ambiguous confession of faith, imposed upon Gregory Nazianzen, who received the Apollinarists as brethren, and not as enemies.<sup>5</sup> He adds, "And no wonder that Vitalis imposed upon Damasus, since by the same confession he imposed upon Gregory Nazianzen:" he ought rather to have said, "No wonder that he imposed upon Gregory, who did not pretend to infallibility, since he imposed upon Damasus, who was infallible." As Vitalis refused to sign the confession sent by Damasus, Paulinus would not admit him to his communion; upon which he pulled off the mask, publicly renounced the communion both of Damasus and Paulinus, and, bidding defiance to the canons, accepted the title and dignity of bishop of Antioch, offered him by Apollinaris. At the same time that heresiarch, finding he could conceal himself no longer, openly declared, that he would communicate with none who held that our Saviour had taken a human soul, and human understanding: which was separating himself from the communion of the catholic church.<sup>6</sup> It was long before it was believed in the church that those tenets had been broached, or were held by Apollinaris: no credit was given, at first, even to his disciples, most people being inclined to think, that they were mistaken, and did not comprehend the sublime thoughts of that great man.<sup>7</sup> But when no room was left for any further doubt, the surprise and concern of the whole catholic party were equal to the high opinion they had entertained of him till that time.<sup>8</sup> When Epiphanius wrote against the Apollinarists, he well knew Apollinaris to be the author of that sect; for he reproaches him with this unwarrantable separation from the church;

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Naz. or. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Vet. Rom. eccles. mon. collect. p. 161.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. p. 180. & Theod. l. 5. c. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Conc. t. 4. p. 826. <sup>5</sup> Naz. or. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Facund. l. 4. c. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Nil. ep. 257.

<sup>8</sup> Basil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 34.

<sup>1</sup> Leont. p. 1031. <sup>2</sup> Id. p. 1032. <sup>3</sup> Id. p. 1035.

<sup>4</sup> Id. p. 1042.

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4.

Soz. l. 6. c. 25. Chron. Alex. p. 688.



A great schism in the church. Basil recurs to the western bishops; who condemn the doctrine of Apollinaris, and depose him with Vitalis and Timotheus. A mistake of Baronius. Another mistake of the same writer. The doctrine of the Millenarians held by the greatest men in the church. How little tradition to be depended upon.

and yet he speaks of him with the greatest respect; seems to think, that many things had been unjustly fathered upon him; and takes a great deal of pains to assure his reader, that what he writes is truth, and not calumny proceeding from any private pique, malice, or grudge.<sup>1</sup>

The schism, which the establishing of a new bishop occasioned in the church of Antioch, was not confined to that alone, but extended to most other churches, over which Apollinaris appointed bishops of his own sect, who held separate assemblies, practised different rites, and, instead of the sacred hymns commonly sung at divine service by the rest of the church, introduced canticles composed by their leader, and containing the substance of his doctrine.<sup>2</sup> The many perplexed questions and difficulties, which he and his emissaries were daily starting about the incarnation, bred such confusion in the minds of men, that many began to question the truth of that mystery.<sup>3</sup> The objections they moved against our Saviour's taking flesh, and being born of the Virgin Mary, seemed calculated merely to raise improper ideas, and sully the thoughts of chaste minds; for they themselves held his body to be coeval with the Divinity, and to have only been conveyed into the world by means of the Virgin Mary.<sup>4</sup> Their doctrine was applauded and received by many, and few who read their books were content with, or kept to the plain and ancient doctrine of the church.<sup>5</sup> Basil, therefore, and the other orthodox bishops in the east, to put a stop the more effectually to the growing evil, not only declaimed against it in all their writings, but despatched the two presbyters, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, with letters to Damasus, and the other western bishops, entreating them to condemn without delay the doctrine of Apollinaris, and Apollinaris himself, since he had at last openly declared against the church, and owned himself the author of the new sect.<sup>6</sup> In compliance with this request, a great council was convened at Rome the following year, 378, in which Apollinaris was not only condemned with great solemnity, but deposed, with his two favourite disciples, Vitalis and Timotheus; the former bishop of the Apollinarists at Antioch, and the latter at Berytus in Phœnicia.<sup>7</sup> By the same council it was defined, that Jesus was true man, and true God; and whoever maintained or affected any thing to be wanting either to his humanity or divinity, was declared an enemy to the church.<sup>8</sup> Vitalis had deceived Damasus, as I have observed above, by a confession of faith, in

which, under equivocal terms, he had artfully concealed his heresy. The bishop of Rome, therefore, now undeceived, caused the confession he had formerly approved of to be anathematized by the council, together with its author, exerting himself, says Gregory Nazianzen, with so much the more vigor against them, as they had formerly taken advantage of his candor and sincerity to impose upon him.<sup>1</sup> Gregory Nazianzen therefore supposes, that the pope could be imposed upon in a matter concerning the faith. Indeed the sticklers for infallibility must either give up that prerogative, or allow all the fathers to have talked nonsense.

Baronius is certainly mistaken, and so was Ruffinus,<sup>2</sup> whom he follows, in asserting the heresy of Apollinaris to have been first condemned by the council of Rome, since it is manifest, that the doctrine of that heresiarch had been condemned long before by Athanasius, Basil, and Epiphanius, in their writings, and by the council held at Alexandria in 362. But Ruffinus probably meant no more, than that those errors were first condemned by the council of Rome, under the name, and together with the person, of Apollinaris; which is undeniable. I cannot help observing here another mistake of Baronius, pretending that Damasus (for whatever was done by the council is by him ascribed to Damasus alone) in condemning Apollinaris, condemned all the errors he held; and consequently the opinion of the Millenarians, holding that Christ was to return upon the earth, and reign over the faithful a thousand years before the end of the world. This opinion was first broached about the year 118, by Papias bishop of Hierapolis, a man of great piety, and honored by the church of Rome as a saint.<sup>3</sup> He declares, in the few fragments of his works, which have been conveyed to us by Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> that, as he lived near the times of the apostles, he made it his chief business to learn of their disciples whatever they could recollect to have been done or said by them, on different occasions, that was not recorded in holy writ. Thus he learned the above-mentioned doctrine,<sup>5</sup> which, upon the authority of such a tradition, countenanced by some passages in the Revelations,<sup>6</sup> and one text in St. Paul, was embraced and held by the most eminent men for piety and learning, at that time, in the church; and, among the rest, by Irenæus, and Justin the Martyr. And yet such a doctrine is now rank heresy in the church of Rome. But, by declaring it such, have they not overset their own system, which places tradition upon a level with the canonical books of the scripture? Can they allege a more ancient tradition, one more universally received, or equally

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. 66. c. 20. 77. c. 2. <sup>2</sup> Basil. ep. 293. Soz. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. ib. 6. c. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Naz. or. 46, & 5. Nil. l. 1. <sup>5</sup> Basil. ep. 74. ep. 257.

<sup>6</sup> Id. ep. 74.

<sup>7</sup> Ruff. l. 2. c. 20. Soz. 1. 6. c. 25.

<sup>8</sup> Ruff. ib. Theod. p. 719. Concil. t. 5. p. 741. Leon. Sulp. p. 1042. Phot. p. 231.

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Naz. or. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Ruff. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Martyrol. Rom. 22 Feb.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. l. 3. c. 33.

<sup>5</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>6</sup> Rev. c. xx.



The Apollinarists condemned by several councils. Penal laws enacted against them. New disturbances raised by Ursinus. Damasus falsely accused, but cleared by the emperor. Some bishops, deposed by Damasus, keep their sees.

countenanced by scripture, in favor of the many traditional articles of faith, which they have obtruded upon the world? Papias declares, he received the above-mentioned doctrine of those who had learned it immediately of the apostles. If such a tradition be rejected as false, what other has a right to be admitted as true? If we deny or question St. Peter's having been at Rome, tradition, and the authority of Irenæus (for all the others have copied from him), are immediately produced against us. But what weight either ought to bear, the case before us sufficiently demonstrates.

To return to Apollinaris: It is very certain, that he held and taught the doctrine of the Millenarians; but it is no less certain, that such a doctrine was not condemned, as Baronius pretends,<sup>1</sup> by the council of Rome in 378, since many eminent men in the church held it, and Sulpitius Severus among the rest, after that council, without being deemed heretics on that score. The sentence pronounced against Apollinaris, and his disciples, by the council of Rome, was confirmed by a council held the same year at Alexandria,<sup>2</sup> by an oecumenical council assembled at Constantinople in 381, and by the council at Antioch in 379.<sup>3</sup> However, the Apollinarists, though thus condemned and deposed by all the councils of the east and west, as we read in Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>4</sup> still kept their ground, till recourse was had to the secular power. For the emperor Theodosius, at the request of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, enacted a law, dated the tenth of March, 388, forbidding the Apollinarists to hold assemblies, to have any ecclesiastics or bishops, or to dwell in the cities.<sup>5</sup> As this law was executed with the utmost rigor, at least against the leading men of the party, who were banished the cities, and confined to the deserts,<sup>6</sup> the Apollinarists were in a few years reduced to a very small number, when they begged to be admitted to the communion of the catholic church, which was in the end granted them by Theodosius,<sup>7</sup> who governed the church of Antioch, from the year 416 to 428. But as their conversion was owing not to conviction, but persecution, they still held in their hearts the same sentiments, which ever must happen in the like case; nay, and privately instilled their errors into the minds of many, whose faith had been, till that time, untainted.<sup>8</sup> It was to these pretended catholics, or disguised Apollinarists, that the Eutychian heresy, and that of the Monothelites, of whom I shall speak hereafter, owed their birth.<sup>9</sup> Hence the emperor Marcian, by an edict in 455, declared the Eutychians to be Apollinarists, and con-

sequently liable to the same penalties.<sup>1</sup> As for Apollinaris himself, he died about the year 392, having maintained, to the hour of his death, the same sentiments, in which he had lived; and, with them, the same outward appearance, at least, of a most holy and exemplary life;<sup>2</sup> which is all the authors of those times will allow him.

While Damasus, and the other western bishops, were wholly intent upon suppressing the heresy of Apollinaris, and restoring the eastern churches to their former tranquillity, the antipope Ursinus, laying hold of that opportunity, arrived privately at Milan, and there joined the Arians, upon their promising to support him with the whole power of their party.<sup>3</sup> But Ambrose, who then governed that church, and kept a watchful eye over the flock committed to his care, gave immediate notice of their clandestine meetings, and pernicious designs, to the emperor Gratian, who soon after ordered Ursinus to quit Italy, and confined him to Cologne.<sup>4</sup> During his exile his partisans were not idle; they found the emperor Gratian, who, in 375, had succeeded his father Valentinian I. warmly engaged in favor of Damasus: they well knew that so long as he continued in that disposition, it would be in vain to solicit the return of Ursinus, or to put up any petition in his behalf. In order therefore to estrange the mind of the emperor from Damasus, they suborned a Jew, named Isaac, who had embraced the Christian religion, but was then returned to Judaism, to accuse him before the civil magistrate of a heinous crime, which I find not specified by any of the ancients. But the emperor, taking upon himself the judging of that cause, soon discovered the innocence of the accused, and the malice of the accuser; and therefore, honorably acquitting the former, and punishing the latter according to his deserts, confined him to a corner of Spain.<sup>5</sup>

This attempt on the reputation of Damasus was not the only thing that gave him great uneasiness at this time. The emperor Valentinian had transferred, as I have related above, the power of judging bishops, such at least as were concerned in the schism of Ursinus, from the civil magistrate to the bishop of Rome. But several bishops, though deposed by him, still maintained themselves in their sees, with open force, in defiance of his sentence, and the imperial law. Among these were the bishop of Parma, and Florentius bishop of Puzzuolo, who, for their attachment to Ursinus, had been both deposed by Damasus, and other bishops assembled at Rome.<sup>6</sup> The Donatists too, notwithstanding the severe laws enacted against them by several emperors, had got footing in Italy, and in Rome

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 118. n. 2. & <sup>2</sup> Ruf. l. 2. c. 20.

373. n. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Naz. ep. 77.

<sup>5</sup> Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 14.

p. 130.

<sup>7</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Leo, ep. 134. c. 2. Pet. dog. t. 4. p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99.

Prædestinat. de hæres. c. 55.

<sup>6</sup> Soz. l. 6. c. 26.

<sup>8</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 4. p. 886, 887.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 104. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Greg. Nys. in Eph. t. 3. p. 609.

<sup>4</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 82, 92.

<sup>5</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 84—92.

<sup>3</sup> Amb. ep. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. p. 82—93.



The Italian bishops recur to the emperor. Their letter to him. What they demand in particular for the bishop of Rome. The emperor's answer. In what sense the pope above other bishops.

itself, where they were known by the names of Montenenses, and Rupenses, on account of their assembling in a church or oratory, which they had among the neighboring rocks and mountains.<sup>1</sup> They had a bishop of their own, either sent from Africa, or ordained by bishops sent from thence for that purpose. Claudian, who governed them at this time, was their fifth bishop of Rome.<sup>2</sup> The emperor ordered him to be sent back to Africa, whence he came. But though he had been several times imprisoned, in order to oblige him by that means to return, he could not even so be prevailed upon to abandon his flock; but continued at Rome, perverting many there, and rebaptizing all he could pervert.<sup>3</sup> To put a stop to these evils, the bishops of Italy, assembling at Rome, had recourse to the emperor Gratian, acquainting him with the conduct of the contumacious bishops, and earnestly entreating him to cause the law, commanding the bishops to be judged by the bishop of Rome, and not by the civil magistrate, which he himself had enacted with his father, to be put in execution. By that law, the emperor, in all likelihood, only intended to confirm, with respect to the bishop of Rome, the canons of the church, appointing the metropolitan, with his council, judge of the bishops of his province in ecclesiastical causes. But the bishops, assembled on this occasion at Rome, attempted to extend the authority of the bishop of Rome, far beyond the bounds to which the emperors and canons had confined it. For, in their letter to Gratian, they suggested the following regulations as necessary for the tranquillity of the church, and entreated him to establish them by law: 1. That if any, who had been condemned by the bishop of Rome, or other catholic bishops, should, after such condemnation, presume to keep their churches, they should be banished from the territories of the cities, where they had been bishops. 2. That such as should refuse, when lawfully summoned, to appear before the bishops, should be obliged, by the prefect of Italy, or his vicar, to repair to Rome, to be judged there. 3. That, if the accused bishop resided in a distant province, he should be obliged, by the judges of the place, to appear before his metropolitan; and, if his metropolitan was suspected as partial, or prejudiced against him, he might be allowed to appeal to the bishop of Rome, or to a council of fifteen neighboring bishops; but, if the accused was himself a metropolitan, he should either repair to Rome, or appear before such judges as the bishop of Rome should appoint; and, when thus condemned, submit to the sentence.<sup>4</sup> In behalf of the bishop of Rome in particular they begged, in the same letter, that, as he "was above other bishops by the prerogative of the apostolic see, though upon

a level with them as to the ministry," he might not be obliged to appear before the civil magistrate, since other bishops had been exempted from their jurisdiction, but before a council, or that the emperor would reserve to himself the cognisance of what concerned him, leaving to the ordinary judges the power of examining facts and witnesses, but not the authority of pronouncing sentence.<sup>1</sup> What answer the emperor returned to the council, we know not; but, in a rescript, addressed to the vicar Aquilinus, after summing up the heads of the letter from the council, and severely reprimanding his officers for their neglect, in not causing the imperial law to be put in execution, he confirms the rescript addressed to Simplicius, which I have mentioned above; commands the bishop of Parma, Florentius of Puzzuolo, and Claudian the Donatist, with all those who shall be condemned by the councils, as disturbers of the quiet of the church, to be driven from their dioceses, and banished a hundred miles from Rome: he grants all the council had desired, with respect to the judging of bishops; but requires the bishop of Rome to act with the advice of five or seven other bishops; and, lastly, he forbids persons of infamous characters, or known slanderers, to be admitted as informers or witnesses against bishops.<sup>2</sup> In this rescript he takes no notice of what the council had asked for the bishop of Rome in particular.

From these pieces, which are still extant, it is manifest beyond all dispute, as the reader must have observed, that, in the year 378, when this council was held, no prerogative was yet discovered in the pope, peculiar to him, and not common to all bishops, besides that of rank, which arose from the dignity of his see, that is, from his being bishop of the metropolis of the empire; for, in that respect alone, the bishops, who composed the council, acknowledged him "to be above them;" nay, by declaring themselves, in express terms, "equal to him as to the ministry," they seem to have taken particular care, that no room or pretence should be left for his claiming a superiority in any other respect. And how great would their surprise have been, had Damasus, in hearing that part of their address to the emperor, started up, and, protesting against it, as derogatory to his prerogative, declared, that, "to him all power was given in Heaven and on earth;" that, "so far from being equal to him, they, and all other bishops, were but his deputies and delegates;" that "the power, authority, and jurisdiction, which they enjoyed, were derived to them from the plenitude of his!" Had he talked in this strain, the whole council would have concluded him delirious. And yet these are the sentiments of his successors; these the very words, with which they and their divines have expressed

<sup>1</sup> Opt. 1. 2. p. 49. Aug. de Unit. c. 3. t. 7. & ep. Hier. 165. chron.

<sup>2</sup> Opt. 1. 2. p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 83, 84.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 85—87.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 87—89.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 90, 91.



The power he now claims unknown in the time of Damasus. A new accusation brought against Damasus. The council of Aquileia writes to the emperor in his behalf. A great council assembled at Constantinople, by the emperor Theodosius.

them;<sup>1</sup> so that it is now reckoned heresy not to believe what in the fourth century it had been deemed madness to have gravely uttered. It would perhaps have seemed still more strange and surprising to the fathers of the council, however prejudiced in his favor, if Damasus, instead of gratefully acknowledging their regard for him in petitioning the emperor, that he might not be judged by the civil magistrate, but either by a council, or the emperor himself, had severely rebuked them as strangers to, or betrayers of, his inherent right, acquainting them, that, in virtue thereof, "all men were to be judged by him, but himself by no man;"<sup>2</sup> that "the greatest monarchs were his slaves and vassals, and he king of kings, monarch of the world, sole lord and governor both in spirituals and temporals;"<sup>3</sup> that "he was appointed prince over all nations and kingdoms;"<sup>4</sup> that "his power excelled all powers;"<sup>5</sup> that "it was necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to him."<sup>6</sup> And yet these are the notions, that have been uttered by his successors, and the very terms in which they were uttered. In the age I am now writing of they have been looked upon no otherwise than the ravings of a distempered brain; but they are now held by the church of Rome, and her divines, as oracles, and inserted as such into her canons. Bellarmine owns, that in the fourth century, the pope was still subject to the emperors, nay, and to the civil magistrate, without the least distinction between him and other vassals. "But this subjection," says he, in his apology against king James,<sup>7</sup> "the emperors exacted by force, because the power of the pope was not known to them." Nor to any body else, he might have added, since the writers of those times seem to have been no better acquainted with the power of the pope than the emperors; at least, they take no notice of it, even in describing, as some of them have done, the state of the church at the time they wrote, and relating the customs, laws, and practices, that then obtained. Besides, how could the power of the pope be unknown to the Christian emperors, if it was one of the chief tenets of the Christian doctrine? Neither Damasus, nor any of his predecessors, can be justly charged with bashfulness, in acquainting the world with the power they had or claimed. We may further observe here, that the emperor requires the bishop of Rome, in judging according to the power granted him, to act with the advice of five or seven other bishops: a plain proof, that he was as little acquaint-

ed with the pope's infallibility, as with his power.

The council of the Italian bishops, assembled at Rome, no sooner broke up, than the emissaries and partisans of Ursinus began to raise new disturbances in that city, by stirring up the pagans against Damasus, and, at the same time, charging him with things, to use the expression of the council of Aquileia, "not fit to be uttered by a bishop, nor heard by such an emperor as Gratian."<sup>1</sup> Anastasius writes, that he was accused of adultery by the two deacons, Concordus and Callistus.<sup>2</sup> And truly, that some crime of that nature was laid to his charge, is pretty plain, from the terms in which it was expressed by the council. Valerian, then governor of Rome, immediately acquainted the emperor with the accusation;<sup>3</sup> but what part Gratian acted on this occasion, we are not told by any ancient writer. We read in the pontificals, and most of the modern writers, that the cause was referred by the emperor to the council then sitting at Aquileia; and that Damasus was declared innocent by all the bishops who composed it. But, as neither is related by any credible author, I am inclined to believe, that Gratian took no notice of the charge, in compliance with the request of the bishops assembled at Aquileia; for, by a letter, they earnestly entreated him not to hearken to Ursinus, because his giving ear to him would occasion endless disturbances in Rome; and besides, they could by no means communicate with a man who thus wickedly aspired to a dignity, to which he had no claim or title; who, by his scandalous behavior, had incurred the hatred of all good Christians; who had impiously joined the Arians, and, together with them, attempted to disturb the quiet of the catholic church of Milan.<sup>4</sup>

Towards the latter end of the pontificate of Damasus, two great councils were held, the one at Constantinople, in 381, and the other at Rome, in 382. The former was assembled by the emperor Theodosius, who, after having put the orthodox in possession of the churches, which till his time had been held by the Arians in the east, where he reigned, summoned all the bishops within his dominions to meet at Constantinople, in order to deliberate about the most proper means of restoring an entire tranquillity to the church, rent and disturbed not only by several sects of heretics, but by the divisions that reigned among the orthodox themselves, by that especially of Antioch, the most ancient of all, which from that church had spread all over the empire, and occasioned rather an entire separation, than a misunderstanding between the east and the west, the former communicating with Meletius, and the latter with Paulinus, as I have related above. In this council many

<sup>1</sup> Bellar. de summ. Pont. l. 4. c. 24. Aug. Triumph. de potest. Eccles. in præf. ad Joh. XXII. Concil. Later. sub Leone X.

<sup>2</sup> Grat. dist. 40. c. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Bonif. VIII. in ap. ad Mart. Polon. & Conc. Vienn. p. 909.

<sup>4</sup> Pius V. in Bull. apud Cam. ad ann. 1570.

<sup>5</sup> Sixt. V. in Bull. contr. Hen. Navar.

<sup>6</sup> Bonif. VIII. extrav. com. l. 1. tit. 8. c. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Bellar. ap. p. 202.

<sup>1</sup> Amb. ep. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Anast. c. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. Theod. ch. p. 104.

<sup>4</sup> Amb. ib.



Which revokes the privilege granted to the see of Rome by the council of Sardica. The council writes to the western bishops. The authority of this council among the Greeks, and the Latins. The popes at variance among and with themselves about it. This council was assembled by the emperor, and not by Damasus.

weighty matters were transacted, and several canons established, some of which, namely, the second and third, deserve to be taken notice of here. For by the second, the council renewed and confirmed the ancient law of the church, authorized by the fourth, fifth, and sixth canons of the council of Nice, commanding the bishops of each province to be ordained by those of the same province, and such of the neighboring provinces as they should think fit to call in; directing all ecclesiastical matters to be settled, all disputes to be finally decided by a council composed of the bishops of the province, or at least of the diocese, that is, of all the provinces under the same vicar; and strictly forbidding the bishops of one diocese to concern themselves, under any color or pretence whatsoever, with what happens in another.<sup>1</sup> By this canon the privilege, formerly granted to the see of Rome by the council of Sardica, was revoked, and all appeals from the council of the diocese forbidden. By the third canon the see of Constantinople is declared first in rank and dignity after that of Rome.<sup>2</sup> Some Greek writers have pretended, that, by this canon, the two sees were declared in every respect equal; but that Zonaras himself owns to be false and groundless.<sup>3</sup> It is to be observed, that the council of Constantinople gave rank and honor to that see, but no jurisdiction. It was to the council of Chalcedon that the bishops of Constantinople owed their authority and jurisdiction; for by that council they were empowered to ordain the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace.<sup>4</sup> The reasons alleged by Baronius to prove the third canon of the council of Constantinople supposititious,<sup>5</sup> are quite frivolous; and it is certain beyond all dispute, that the bishops of that city maintained ever after the rank, which the above-mentioned canon had given them. In a short time the bishop of Constantinople, taking advantage of that canon, and of the deference that is naturally paid to the bishop of the imperial city, extended his jurisdiction over all the neighboring provinces, nay, and over the whole eastern empire, as we shall observe in the sequel of this history.

The canons of this council were, without all doubt, sent, according to custom, to the western bishops for their approbation, probably with the letter which the council wrote to them concerning the heresy of Apollinaris.<sup>6</sup> And yet pope Leo the Great writes, that the third canon was never notified to the church of Rome;<sup>7</sup> but Gregory the Great, that the canon condemning the Eudoxians, which was the first, had never been received at Rome:<sup>8</sup> but Gregory perhaps meant nothing else, than

that the canon he mentions was of no authority at Rome. As for Leo, it is hard to conceive what he meant by saying, that the third canon was not known to the church of Rome; for he could not but know, that the bishop of Constantinople held the second rank in the church, and the first in the east, since his own legates, whose conduct he entirely approved of, owned him to have an indisputable right to that rank; nay, Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum, in Phrygia, maintained that it was with the consent and approbation of Leo himself that the see of Constantinople enjoyed that honor.

The authority of this council has ever been great among the Greeks, who style it an oecumenical council, and had often recourse to it as such in the council of Chalcedon.<sup>1</sup> The bishops of the Hellespont speak of it with the greatest respect and reverence, in a letter they wrote to the emperor Leo.<sup>2</sup> As for the Latins, I find a great disagreement among the popes themselves concerning the authority of this council; nay, the greatest of them all disagrees even with himself about it. The legates of pope Leo rejected its canons, alleging that they had never been inserted in the book of the canons.<sup>3</sup> In like manner the popes Simplicius and Felix II. speaking of the councils which they received, name those only of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.<sup>4</sup> Gregory the Great writes, that the church of Rome had neither the acts nor the canons of the council of Constantinople; that the condemnation of the Macedonians was the only thing done by that council which they admitted; and that as to other heresies condemned there, they rejected them as having been condemned before by other councils.<sup>5</sup> But he declares elsewhere, and often repeats it, that he received the four oecumenical councils, as he did the four gospels,<sup>6</sup> naming the council of Constantinople in the second place. In the same manner, and with the same words, were the four oecumenical councils received by Gelasius, and several popes before him, as well as by Martin I. and several others after him: so that the council of Constantinople is, according to some popes, of equal authority with the gospel; according to others, of no authority at all: nay, it is thus by the same pope at one time extolled, at another undervalued. Let Baronius and Bellarmine reconcile these contradictions, if they can.

That this council was assembled by the emperor Theodosius, is affirmed by all the writers who speak of it,<sup>7</sup> nay, and by the bishops who composed it.<sup>8</sup> And yet Baronius has the assurance to assert, as a thing not to be questioned, that it was convened by Dama-

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 9. Concil. t. 2. p. 947.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Zon. in can. p. 70. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 795—798.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 37, 38.

<sup>6</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 826.

<sup>7</sup> Leo, ep. 53. c. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Greg. 5. ep. 31.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 4. p. 945.

<sup>3</sup> Conc. t. 4. p. 809. Marca de concord. sacer. & imp. l. 3. c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Lup. ep. 53. c. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Greg. l. 6. ep. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Id. l. 1. ep. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 6. Naz. or. 14. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Ep. syn. conc. t. 1. p. 872.



The disturbances in the church of Antioch increased. Flavianus ordained bishop of Antioch.

sus,<sup>1</sup> which none of the ancients have so much as once named: and this assertion he founds upon the authority of the universally exploded acts of Damasus; of certain manuscripts, which he knows very little of, and nobody else any thing; and of a passage in the acts of the sixth oecumenical council, where it is said, that Theodosius and Damasus opposed with great firmness the Macedonian heresy; whence the annalist concludes, by what rules of logic I leave the reader to find out, that the council, which condemned the heresy of Macedonius, was convened by the authority of Damasus, backed by that of the emperor.<sup>2</sup> Christianus Lupus, more honest than Baronius, though no less attached to the see of Rome, ingenuously owns, that the council was assembled by the emperor alone; but adds, that Damasus confirmed it;<sup>3</sup> which is true, if he means no more than that Damasus accepted the decrees made by the council; for it was not his, but the emperor's approbation, that gave them a sanction; and accordingly they wrote, not to him, but to the emperor, acquainting him, by whose command they had been called together, with the decrees they had made, and requesting him to confirm them with his seal and sentence.<sup>4</sup> This council consisted of an hundred and fifty bishops, among whom were thirty-six Macedonians, whom Theodosius had particularly summoned, hoping to reunite them with the catholics.<sup>5</sup> No mention is made of letters or deputies sent either by Damasus, or by any of the western bishops; and Theodoret assures us in two different places,<sup>6</sup> that Theodosius only assembled the eastern bishops. Meletius of Antioch presided; for Gregory of Nyssa styled him in full council, our father and head.<sup>7</sup> Upon his death (for he died while the council was sitting) that honor was conferred on Gregory Nazianzen, appointed by the emperor and the council bishop of Constantinople;<sup>8</sup> but he resigning, soon after, his new dignity, his successor Nectarius was named to preside in his room.<sup>9</sup>

One of the chief motives that induced Theodosius to assemble so numerous a council at Constantinople, was, to hear what remedy they could suggest against the schism of the church of Antioch, which caused such jealousies between the east and the west as seemed to forebode an imminent rupture.<sup>10</sup> But before the fathers of the council entered upon that important subject, Meletius died; and his death, which ought to have put an end to the present disturbances, served only to increase them, and engage the contending parties more warmly in the dispute. It had been agreed by Meletius and Paulinus, that the survivor

should be sole bishop of all the orthodox at Antioch.<sup>1</sup> Socrates and Sozomen add,<sup>2</sup> that six presbyters, who it was most likely might be one day raised to that see, bound themselves by a solemn oath not to vote for any other, nor to accept themselves the episcopal dignity, so long as either of the two lived. However, Meletius was no sooner dead, than some of the prelates present at the council moved for choosing him a successor, which occasioned many long and warm debates. Gregory Nazianzen, elected bishop of Constantinople a few days before, exerted all his eloquence to divert the council from a resolution, which, he said, would prove fatal to the church, and kindle a flame, which perhaps it might never be in their power to extinguish.<sup>3</sup> Several other prelates, enemies to strife and contention, falling in with Gregory, spoke to the same purpose, exhorting their colleagues, with great zeal and eloquence, to put an end at last to the unhappy divisions that had so long rent the church, by allowing Paulinus, already stricken in years, to govern peaceably the remaining part of his life.<sup>4</sup> But the far greater part were for a new election, offering no other reason to recommend such a step, but that the east, where our Savior had appeared, ought not to yield to the west.<sup>5</sup> So that the resolution of giving a successor to Meletius was taken merely out of pique to the western bishops, who, having the bishop of Rome at their head, had begun to treat their brethren in the east with great haughtiness, and assume an air of authority that did not become them; but that had been better represented on any other occasion than on this.

The resolution being taken, Flavianus, a presbyter of the church of Antioch, was named by the council, and, with the approbation of the emperor, and of all the Meletians at Antioch, ordained in that city. He is commended by the writers who lived in or near those times, as a man of an exemplary life, and extraordinary piety, as a zealous defender of the orthodox faith, and opposer of the Arian heresy, as a mirror of every sacerdotal virtue; and barring the right of Paulinus, the most worthy and deserving person the council could name to succeed the great Meletius.<sup>6</sup> These, and other like encomiums, bestowed upon Flavianus by the writers of those times, leave no room to doubt but Socrates and Sozomen were misinformed in naming him among the six presbyters who took the oath I have mentioned above; the rather as no notice is taken of such an oath by his most inveterate enemies, in the many disputes that arose about his ordination. Gregory Nazianzen, who had been lately preferred to the see of Constantinople, and had accepted that dignity with no other view, but to re-

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 281. n. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib. n. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Lup. notæ in can. 1, 2. p. 74.

<sup>4</sup> Vide Bar. ad ann. 281. n. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 2. 6, & 7.

<sup>7</sup> Nyss. de Mel. p. 587.

<sup>8</sup> Id. ib. p. 589. & Naz.

<sup>9</sup> Vide Lup. t. 1. p. 275.

car. 1. p. 27.

<sup>10</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 76, 77.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. car. 1. p. 24—26.

<sup>4</sup> Id. ib. <sup>5</sup> Id. ib. p. 27.

<sup>6</sup> Vide Theod. l. 5. c. 9. & Cod. Theod. ap. p. 164.



Gregory Nazianzen resigns the bishopric of Constantinople. Nectarius is chosen in his room. The council of Aquileia writes to Theodosius in favor of Paulinus. And the bishops of Italy in favor of Maximus. Who Maximus was, and how chosen bishop of Constantinople.

move all jealousies, and restore a good understanding between the east and the west, being sensible that the electing of a new bishop in the room of Meletius would widen the breach, and obstruct all possible means of an accommodation, resigned his dignity, and, to the inexpressible grief of his flock, retired both from the council and city.<sup>1</sup> In one of his orations,<sup>2</sup> he ascribes this resolution to the divisions that reigned among the bishops, declaring that he was quite tired with their constant quarreling and bickering among themselves, and comparing them to children at play; whom to join in their childish diversions, would be degrading a serious character. Upon the resignation of Gregory, Nectarius was chosen to succeed him; but, as to the particulars of his election, they are variously related by authors, and foreign to my purpose. He was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, descended of an illustrious and senatorial family, but at the time of his election still a layman, and prætor of Constantinople; nay, he had not been baptized.<sup>3</sup>

The same year that the eastern bishops met at Constantinople, by the command of Theodosius, the western bishops met at Aquileia, by the command of Gratian. While the latter were yet sitting, news was brought of the death of Meletius, and at the same time they received certain intelligence of the resolution which the council of Constantinople had taken of appointing him a successor. Hereupon having despatched the business for which they had met, and condemned Palladius and Secundianus, the only two Arian bishops now in the west, they despatched some presbyters into the east, with a letter to the emperor Theodosius, wherein, after expressing the joy it had given them to hear that the orthodox in those parts were at last happily delivered from the oppression of the Arians, they complained of the hardships Paulinus had met with, whom they had always acknowledged as lawful bishop of Antioch, put the emperor in mind of the agreement between Paulinus and Meletius, and concluded with entreating him to assemble an oecumenical council at Alexandria, as the only means of restoring tranquillity to the church, and settling a perfect harmony amongst her members.<sup>4</sup> Before this letter reached the emperor, the council of Constantinople was concluded, and the bishops returned to their respective sees. However, Theodosius recalled some of them, in order to govern himself by their advice in granting or denying the western bishops their request.<sup>5</sup> But the election of Flavianus being in the mean time known in the west, the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, then assembled in council with Ambrose, bishop of

Milan, at their head, wrote a long letter to Theodosius, complaining of that election, openly espousing at the same time the cause of Maximus against Nectarius, the new bishop of Constantinople, and threatening to separate themselves entirely from the communion of the eastern bishops, unless Maximus was acknowledged lawful bishop of that city, or at least an oecumenical council was assembled to examine the claims of the two competitors, and to confirm with their joint suffrages the disputed dignity to him, who had the best.<sup>1</sup> They also desired, in the same letter, to have the contest between Paulinus and Flavianus decided.

Maximus, surnamed the Cynic, because he had from his youth professed the philosophy, and wore the habit of that sect, was a man of a most infamous character, and had been publicly whipped in Egypt, his native country, and confined to the city of Oasis, for crimes not fit to be mentioned.<sup>2</sup> Being released from his banishment, he wandered all over the east, and was every where equally abhorred and detested on account of his matchless impudence and scandalous manners.<sup>3</sup> At last he repaired to Constantinople, where he had not been long, when, by one of the boldest attempts mentioned in history, he caused himself to be installed and ordained bishop of that city: for the doors of the church being broken open in the dead of the night, by a band of Egyptian mariners, he was placed on the episcopal chair in the profane dress of a cynic, by some bishops whom his friends had sent out of Egypt for that purpose. But the people, and some of the clergy, in the adjoining houses, being alarmed at the noise, and crowding to see what occasioned it, Maximus and his unhallowed crew thought fit to withdraw, and complete the ceremony in a place better adapted to such a scene of profaneness, the house of a player on the flute.<sup>4</sup> Maximus, thus ordained, in equal defiance of the imperial laws and canons of the church, had the assurance to claim the see of Constantinople as his right, and to protest against the election of Gregory Nazianzen, and likewise of Nectarius, who was chosen upon the resignation of Gregory, though they had both been named to that dignity by the council of Constantinople, that is, by all the eastern bishops. But no regard being had to his protest, nay, his ordination being declared null by the council, and he driven out of the city by the populace, and rejected with indignation by the emperor, he had recourse to the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, then assembled in council with Ambrose, bishop of Milan, at their head, as I have observed above. These giving an entire credit to the accounts of the lying and deceitful cynic, as

<sup>1</sup> Naz. ep. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Id. or. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 8. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Ruff. l. 2. c. 21. Soz. l. 7. c. 8, & 10.

<sup>4</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 75—78. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 103—107.

<sup>2</sup> Naz. or. 23. & car. 148.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Id. car. 1. p. 14, 15. & or. 28.



He is acknowledged by Ambrose, and the Italian bishops. The emperor's answer to their letter. A council of all the western bishops assembled at Rome. The misunderstanding between the east and the west increased.

they were quite unacquainted with what had passed in the east, not only admitted him to their communion, but, without farther inquiry or examination, acknowledged him for lawful bishop of Constantinople, and wrote the above mentioned letter to Theodosius in his behalf.<sup>1</sup> We must not confound this council with that of Aquileia, as I find most writers have done: for the latter was composed of almost all the western bishops under Valerian bishop of that place; whereas the council I am now speaking of, consisted only of the bishops of the vicariate of Italy, under the bishop of Milan, their metropolitan. It is surprising that Ambrose, and the other bishops of that council, should not have been better informed with respect to the ordination of Maximus, since Acholius bishop of Thessalonica, with five other bishops of Macedon, had, at least a year before, transmitted to Damasus a minute account of it, agreeing in every particular with that which I have given above from Gregory Nazianzen.<sup>2</sup> The letter from the council caused no small surprise in Theodosius: he was sensible they had suffered themselves to be grossly imposed upon; but, not judging it necessary to undeceive them, he only told them, in his answer to their letter, that the reasons they alleged did not seem sufficient to him for assembling an oecumenical council, and giving so much trouble to the prelates of the church; that they were not to concern themselves with what happened in the east, nor remove the bounds, that had been wisely placed by their forefathers between the east and the west; and that, as to the affair of Maximus, by espousing his cause they had betrayed either an unwarrantable animosity against the orientals, or an inexcusable credulity in giving credit to false and groundless reports.<sup>3</sup>

Upon the receipt of this letter, the Italian bishops, finding Theodosius no ways disposed to assemble an oecumenical council, applied to Gratian, who not only granted them leave to meet at Rome, the place they chose, but despatched letters to all the bishops both in the east and west, giving them notice of the time and place, in which the council was to be held, and inviting them to it.<sup>4</sup> But of all the eastern bishops, two only complied with this invitation; namely, Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in the island of Cyprus, and Paulinus, whom all the west acknowledged for lawful bishop of Antioch. The western bishops were all present, either in person, or by their deputies; and Damasus presided.<sup>5</sup> But, as to the transactions of this great assembly, we are almost entirely in the dark; for all we know of them is, that they

unanimously agreed not to communicate with Flavianus, the new bishop of Antioch, nor with Diodorus of Tarsus, or Acacius of Beræa, who had been chiefly instrumental in his promotion; that they condemned the heresy of Apollinaris; and that, at the request of Damasus, a confession of faith was drawn up by Jerom, and approved by the council, which the Apollinarists were to sign, upon their being readmitted to the communion of the church.<sup>1</sup> As for Maximus, they seemed to have abandoned his cause, being, in all likelihood undeceived, with respect to his ordination, by Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, and St. Jerom, who assisted at the council, and could not be strangers to the character of Maximus, nor unacquainted with the scandalous methods by which he had attained the episcopal dignity.

The resolution they took not to communicate with Flavianus, whose election, though imprudently made, was undoubtedly canonical, and had been approved and confirmed by the oecumenical council of Constantinople, not only increased the jealousies and misunderstanding between the east and west, but occasioned a great disagreement, and endless quarrels, among the eastern bishops themselves. For those who acknowledged Paulinus, namely, the bishops of Egypt, of the island of Cyprus, of Arabia, insisted upon the deposition of Flavianus.<sup>2</sup> Nestorius mentions some letters, written by the bishops of Egypt against Flavianus, with great virulency, and a "tyrannical spirit," to use his expression.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the bishops of Syria, of Palæstine, of Phœnicia, Armenia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, not only maintained, with equal warmth, the election of Flavianus, but began to treat their brethren in the east, who had joined the western bishops against them, as schismatics, as betrayers of their trust, as transgressors of the canons of Nice, commanding the elections and ordinations of each province to be made and performed by the bishops of the same province, and all disputes concerning them to be finally decided in the place where they had begun.<sup>4</sup> This schism occasioned great confusion in the church, which continued till the year 398, when Chrysostom, after having, with indefatigable pains, long labored in vain to bring about an accommodation between the east and the west, had at last, soon after his promotion to the see of Constantinople, the satisfaction of seeing his pious endeavors crowned with success, as I shall relate in a more proper place.

From this whole account it is manifest, as the reader must have observed, that the ori-

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104—107.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Holsten. coll. vet. Rom. eccles. monument. p. 37—40.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99—101.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. ep. 27. Theod. l. 5. c. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. ep. 16. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. Ambr. ep. 22.

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Holst. coll. t. 2. p. 37. Ruf. de orig. lib. adulter. p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> Theodor. l. 5. c. 23. Socr. l. 5. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Mercat. opera, t. 2. p. 86. n. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Theodor. l. 5. c. 23.



No regard paid by the eastern bishops to the judgment of the pope. The custom of appointing vicars introduced by Damasus, and on what occasion. The institution of vicars improved by the succeeding popes. Legates vested with greater power than vicars.

entals paid no manner of regard either to the judgment of the bishop of Rome, or to that of the whole body of the western bishops, assembled in council under him. For though they well knew the bishop of Rome, and his colleagues in the west to be warmly engaged in favor of Paulinus, yet they refused to acknowledge him, even after the death of Meletius; and therefore raised Flavianus to the see of Antioch, in the room of Meletius; and confirmed that election in an oecumenical council. The western bishops exclaimed against it, desiring it might be referred to the decision of a general council. But not even to that demand would the orientals agree, thinking, as they declared in their answer, that there was no occasion for a council, since Flavianus had been chosen and ordained by the bishops of the diocess, which was all the canons of Nice required. They therefore exhorted them to divest themselves of all prejudices, to sacrifice all private affections to the peace and unity of the church, and to put an end to the present, and prevent all future disputes, by approving, with their joint suffrages, an election which had been approved and confirmed by an oecumenical council.<sup>1</sup>

To return to Damasus: he was the first who introduced the custom, which his successors took care to improve, of conferring on certain bishops the title of their vicars, pretending thereby to impart to them an extraordinary power, enabling them to perform several things, which they could not perform in virtue of their own. Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, was the first who enjoyed this title, being, by Damasus, appointed his vicar in East Illyricum, on the following occasion: Illyricum, comprising all ancient Greece, and many provinces on the Danube, whereof Sirmium was the capital, had, ever since the time of Constantine, belonged to the western empire. But, in the year 379, Dacia and Greece were, by Gratian, disjoined from the more westerly provinces, and added, in favor of Theodosius, to the eastern empire, being known by the name of East Illyricum, whereof Thessalonica, the metropolis of Macedon, was the chief city. The bishops of Rome, as presiding in the metropolis of the empire, had begun to claim a kind of jurisdiction, or rather inspection in ecclesiastical matters, over all the provinces of the western empire; which was the first great step by which they ascended to the supremacy they afterwards claimed and established. This Damasus was unwilling to resign with respect to Illyricum, even after that country was dismembered from the western, and added to the eastern empire. In order therefore to maintain his claim, he appointed Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, to act in his stead, vesting in him the power which he pretended to have over those provinces. Upon the death

of Acholius he conferred the same dignity on his successor, Anysius, as did the following popes on the succeeding bishops of Thessalonica, who, by thus supporting the pretensions of Rome, became the first bishops, and, in a manner, the patriarchs, of East Illyricum; for they are sometimes distinguished with that title. This, however, was not done without opposition, the other metropolitans not readily acknowledging for their superior one who, till that time, had been their equal.<sup>1</sup> Syricius, who succeeded Damasus, enlarging the power claimed by his predecessor, decreed, that no bishop should be ordained in East Illyricum without the consent and approbation of the bishop of Thessalonica.<sup>2</sup> But it was some time before this decree took place. Pope Innocent I. writes, that his predecessors committed to the care of Acholius, Achaia, Thessaly, the two Epiruses, Candia, the two Dacias, Mœsia, Dardania, and Prævalitana, now part of Albania, empowering him to judge and decide the controversies that might arise there, and appointing him to be "the first among the primates, without prejudicing the primacy of those churches."<sup>3</sup> Thus were the bishops of Thessalonica first appointed vicars or vicegerents of the bishops of Rome, probably in the year 382, for in that year Acholius assisted at the council of Rome, and it was, in all likelihood, on that occasion that Damasus vested him with this new dignity. The contrivance of Damasus was notably improved by his successors, who, in order to extend and enlarge their authority, conferred the title of their vicars, and the pretended power annexed to it, on the most eminent prelates of other provinces and kingdoms, engaging them thereby to depend upon them, and to promote the authority of their see, to the utter suppression of the ancient rights and liberties both of bishops and synods. This dignity was for the most part annexed to certain sees, but sometimes conferred on particular persons. Thus was Austin appointed the pope's vicar in England, Boniface in Germany; and both, in virtue of the power which they pretended to have been imparted to them with that title, usurped and exercised an authority above that of metropolitans. The institution of vicars was, by the succeeding popes, improved into that of legates, or, to use De Marca's expression, the latter institution was grafted on the former.<sup>4</sup> The legates were vested with a far greater power than the vicars, or, as pope Leo expresses it, "were admitted to a far greater share of his care, though not to the plenitude of his power."<sup>5</sup> They were sent on proper occasions into all countries, and never failed exerting, to the utmost stretch, their boasted power, oppressing, in virtue of their paramount authority, the clergy

<sup>1</sup> Vide Christ. Lup. de Rom. Apell. p. 627, 628.

<sup>2</sup> Coll. Rom. Holsten. p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 48, 49.

<sup>4</sup> De Marc. concord. sacerdot. & imp. l. 6. c. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Leo. ep. 48.



The sending legates no proof of the pope's universal jurisdiction. The disingenuity of Bellarmine. Damasus dies. The decrees ascribed to him supposititious. His writings in prose and verse.

as well as the people, and extorting from both large sums, to support the pomp and luxury in which they lived.

The custom of appointing vicars and legates may well be alleged as a remarkable instance of the craft and policy of the popes, since, of all the methods they ever devised (and many they have devised) to extend and establish their power, none has better answered their ambitious views. But how Bellarmine could lay so much stress upon it as he does,<sup>1</sup> to prove, that the pope has, by divine right, a sovereign authority and jurisdiction over all the churches of the earth, is inconceivable. For it is certain, beyond all dispute, that such a custom had never been heard of till the time of Damasus, that is, till the latter end of the fourth century, when it was first introduced, upon the dismembering of East Illyricum, by Gratian, from the western empire. Damasus did not even then claim that sovereign and unlimited power, with which Bellarmine is pleased to vest him, but only a kind of inspection over the provinces of the western empire, as bishop of the first see. And here I cannot help observing the disingenuity of Bellarmine, who, in speaking of this institution, expresses himself thus: "Leo appointed Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, his vicar in the east, in the same manner as the predecessors of Anastasius had been vicars to the predecessors of Leo."<sup>2</sup> From these words every reader would naturally conclude, and Bellarmine designs they should, that the bishops of Thessalonica had been the pope's vicars from the beginning, or time out of mind; whereas it is certain, that this institution had taken place but a few years before. Pope Leo I. in conferring on Anastasius the vicariate dignity of his see, as he styles it, declared, that he followed therein the example of his predecessor, Syricius,<sup>3</sup> who first appointed Anysius to act in his stead. But he was doubly mistaken; for these vicars were first instituted, as is notorious, by Damasus, and not by Syricius; and it was not by Syricius, but by Damasus, that Anysius was vested with that dignity.<sup>4</sup> The bishop of Thessalonica is styled, by the ancient writers, the pope's vicar in East Illyricum, which is manifestly confining his vicariate jurisdiction to that district; but Bellarmine extends it at once all over the east, by distinguishing him with the title of the pope's vicar for the east.<sup>5</sup> But how little regard was paid to the pope's authority in the east, I have sufficiently shown above.

I find nothing else in the ancient writers concerning Damasus worthy of notice, besides his generously undertaking the defence of Symmachus, who, being prefect of Rome in 384, the last year of Damasus' life, and a sworn enemy to the Christians, was falsely

accused to the emperor, as if he had with great cruelty persecuted and oppressed them. But Damasus had the generosity to take his part, and clear him, by a letter he wrote to the emperor, from that charge.<sup>1</sup> This was one of the last acts of Damasus' life; for he died this year, on the 10th or 11th of December, being then in the eightieth year of his age, after he had governed the church of Rome for the space of eighteen years and about two months.<sup>2</sup> He was buried, according to Anastasius,<sup>3</sup> near his mother and sister, in a church which he had built at the catacombs, on the way to Ardea; whence that place, though part of the cemetery of Calixtus, is by some called the cemetery of Damasus.<sup>4</sup> He proposed at first being buried near the remains of St. Sixtus, and his companions; but afterwards changed his mind, lest he should disturb the ashes of the saints.<sup>5</sup> He caused the church of St. Laurence, near the theatre of Pompey, probably that which his father and he himself had formerly served, to be rebuilt, enlarged and embellished; whence it is still known by the joint titles of St. Laurence and Damasus.<sup>6</sup> In that church his body is worshipped to this day. But, how or when it was removed thither, nobody knows.<sup>7</sup> Several decrees are ascribed to Damasus by Gratian, Ivo of Chartres, Anastasius, and others, but all evidently forged by some impostor blindly addicted to the see of Rome, and quite unacquainted with the discipline of the church in the fourth century. In one of them a canon is quoted from the council of Nice, forbidding the laity to eat or drink of any thing that was offered to the holy priests, because none but the Jewish priests were allowed to eat of the bread that was offered on the altar. We know of no such canon; and besides, it is not at all probable, that the council of Nice would have restrained the clergy from sharing, at least with the poor, what was offered them. In another of these decrees the paying of tithes is commanded, on pain of excommunication; whereas, it might be easily made appear, that, in the fourth century, the offerings destined for the maintenance of the clergy were still voluntary. Another decree supposes, that, by an ancient custom, all metropolitans swore fealty to the apostolic see, and could ordain no bishops till they had received the pall from Rome. For the sake of this, Baronius admits all the rest: but of such a custom not the least mention, or distant hint, is to be met with in any ancient writer.

Damasus is ranked by Jerom<sup>8</sup> among the ecclesiastical writers, on account of the many small pieces he wrote, chiefly in verse; for he had a particular genius for poetry, and was

<sup>1</sup> Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Coll. Rom. Holsten. p. 145.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 46—49.

<sup>5</sup> Bell. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Sym. l. 10. ep. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 103.

<sup>3</sup> Anast. c. 38.

<sup>4</sup> Aring. l. 3. c. 12. n. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Vide Bar. in app. ann. 384. n. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Front. cal. p. 50. Bar. ad. ann. 384. n. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Aring. l. 3. c. 12.

<sup>8</sup> Hier. vir. ill. c. 103.



Jerom kept at Rome, and employed by him. Psalmody falsely ascribed to him. His character.

no despicable poet, if some compositions ascribed to him were truly his. He wrote several books, both in prose and verse, in commendation of virginity; but neither that, nor any of his other works, has reached our times, besides some letters, and a few epigraphs, inscriptions, and epigrams, which have been carefully collected by Baronius,<sup>1</sup> though it may be justly questioned whether the several pieces ascribed to him by that writer were written by him. A short history of the first popes, styled the Pontifical of Damasus, and published together with the councils, has long passed for the work of Damasus; but now even Baronius owns it not to be his; and most critics are of opinion, that it was written after the time of Gregory the Great; nay, some ascribe it to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who flourished in the ninth century.<sup>2</sup> As for his letters, those to Aurelius of Carthage, to Stephen, styled archbishop of the council of Mauritania, to Prosper, primate of Numidia, to the bishops of Italy, are all spurious, as well as the letters to which some of them are answers, and supposed to have been forged by that notorious impostor Isidorus Mercator.<sup>3</sup> His genuine letters are, the two that are to be found among the works of Jerom, to whom they were written; two to Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, published by Holstenius in his collection of the ancient monuments of the church of Rome;<sup>4</sup> a letter of great length to Paulinus of Antioch, whereof the chief heads are set down by Theodoret, in his history, as are likewise those of his letter to the Orientals concerning Timotheus, the favorite disciple of Apollinaris. Several letters from the councils, that were held in Rome in his time, and at which he presided, are still extant, and may well be ascribed to him. The two letters to Jerom are well worth perusing, being written in a pure, easy, and elegant style, and with a great deal of spirit, vivacity, and even gaiety, though Damasus was then much advanced in years, and overburdened with cares and business.<sup>5</sup> In one of them he declares, that his only delight was to read the scriptures; and that all other books, however well written, gave him rather disgust than pleasure. Jerom returned to Rome from the east in 382, with Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and Paulinus, of Antioch, to assist at the council held there. The other two returned to their sees; but Jerom continued at Rome, being kept there by Damasus, who employed him in answering the letters he received from the councils of several churches applying to him for his advice.<sup>6</sup> Damasus, taken with his learning and erudition, and chiefly with the knowledge he had of the scripture, had long before lived in great intimacy with him, and upon his leaving Rome wrote frequent letters to him, not think-

ing it beneath the rank he held in the church to consult him as his master about the true meaning of some difficult passages in holy writ.<sup>1</sup> Thus in one of his letters he desires him to explain the parable of the prodigal son,<sup>2</sup> and in another to interpret the word hosanna, which he says was differently interpreted by different writers, who seemed to contradict each other.<sup>3</sup> In compliance with this request, Jerom wrote the piece on that subject, which is still extant. It was likewise at the desire of Damasus that he corrected the Latin version of the New Testament, and revised at Rome the Latin version of the Psalms, comparing it with the Greek text of the Septuagint. But as to the letter, with which Damasus is supposed to have encouraged him to undertake that work, it is evidently supposititious, and altogether unworthy of him.

Anastasius ascribes to Damasus the custom of singing, instead of reading, the psalms at Divine service.<sup>4</sup> But it is manifest from Austin, that this practice was brought from the east, and first complied with by the church of Milan,<sup>5</sup> in the year 386, that is, two years after the death of Damasus. So long as Damasus lived, Jerom continued at Rome; but as, by his learning and exemplary life, he was an eye-sore to the lewd, ignorant, and haughty clergy of Rome, or as he styles them, "the senate of pharisees,"<sup>6</sup> he thought it advisable to abandon the city upon the death of his great friend and protector, and retire to Jerusalem, hoping to find there that quiet and tranquillity which he despaired of being able to enjoy while he dwelt with "the scarlet whore,"<sup>7</sup> that is, while he lived at Rome. As for the character of Damasus; Jerom styles him, "a virgin doctor of the virgin church;" and, in his letter to Eustochium, "a man of great excellence." Theodoret commends him as a man of a holy life, as one who declined no fatigue or labor to support and maintain the doctrine of the apostles, and who struck the Arians with terror, though he attacked them at a distance.<sup>8</sup> Elsewhere he calls him the famous Damasus,<sup>9</sup> and places him at the head of the most celebrated teachers of truth, who, till his time, had appeared in the west.<sup>10</sup> That Greek writer could not be biassed in his favor, though Jerom perhaps was. The orientals declared, in 431, that they followed the example of Damasus, and other persons eminent for learning;<sup>11</sup> and the council of Chalcedon, speaking of his letter to Paulinus of Antioch, styles him the honor and glory of Rome for piety and justice.<sup>12</sup> The church of Rome honors him as a saint, and his festival is kept in some places on the 10th, in others on

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 584. n. 21.    <sup>2</sup> Bolland. propyl. p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ib. & Du Pin. Biblioth. p. 459.

<sup>4</sup> Holsten. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 37, & 180.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. ep. 124, & 144.

<sup>6</sup> Id. ep. 11. Ruff. de Orig. p. 197.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ep. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ep. 146.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ep. 144.

<sup>4</sup> Anast. c. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. confess. l. 9. c. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. in præf. version. Did. de Spir. Sanct.

<sup>7</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>8</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 2. & l. 4. c. 27.

<sup>9</sup> Id. ep. 144.

<sup>10</sup> Id. ep. 145.

<sup>11</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 740.    <sup>12</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 82.



the 11th of December. But, after all, that he got the pontificate by the most horrible violence and bloodshed; that he lived in great state; that he had frequent and grand entertainments; that he kept a table, which, in sumptuousness, vied with the tables of the emperors themselves; and all this at the expense of the Roman ladies, whose generous contributions might have been applied to better uses; is affirmed by contemporary and unexceptionable writers. It is likewise manifest from the letters of Jerom, that in his time the discipline of the church was greatly re-

laxed; that the observance of the primitive canons was almost utterly neglected; and that luxury, ignorance, and debauchery, universally prevailed among the ecclesiastics at Rome. And this charge against his clergy in some degree recoils upon him, since he appears to have carried the papal authority farther than any of his predecessors, and therefore might have restrained and corrected them. Whether his sanctity may not from all this be justly questioned, notwithstanding the favorable testimony of some ancient writers, I leave the reader to judge.

## SYRICIUS, THIRTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[VALENTINIAN, THEODOSIUS, ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.]

[Year of Christ 384.] SYRICIUS, the successor of Damasus, according to the pontificals, and some ancient monuments quoted and received by Baronius,<sup>1</sup> was a native of Rome, the son of one Tiburtius, had been first reader, and afterwards deacon, under Liberius, and, upon his death, had zealously espoused the cause of Damasus against Ursinus and his party. Damasus being dead, he was chosen in his room by the unanimous acclamations of the whole Roman people, being at that time presbyter of the church known by the title of the Pastor, perhaps the most ancient church in Rome.<sup>2</sup> Ursinus, who was still alive, did not fail, upon the vacancy of the see, to revive his former claim; but he was rejected with scorn and indignation. Valentinian the younger, who then reigned in Italy under the direction of his mother Justina, received the news of this election with great joy; and, concluding from the unanimity of the electors, the worth and merit of the person elected, confirmed Syricius in his new dignity, by a rescript dated the 23d of February, and directed to Pinianus, at that time either prefect or vicar of Rome.<sup>3</sup> \*

The first thing I read of Syricius is his answering a letter or relation which Himerius, bishop of Tarragon in Spain, had sent to Damasus by Bassianus, a presbyter of that church, requiring the advice of the church of Rome concerning some points of discipline, and certain abuses that prevailed in Spain. Damasus being dead before the arrival of Bassianus, Syricius, who had succeeded him,

caused this relation or letter to be read, and carefully examined, in an assembly of his brethren, that is, perhaps, of the bishops who had assisted at his ordination; and, having maturely weighed and considered every article, he first acquainted Himerius with his promotion, and then returned to each the following answers.<sup>1</sup> The first was concerning the sacrament of baptism, which was by some bishops of Spain rejected as null and invalid, when conferred by an Arian minister. In opposition to them, Syricius alleges the authority of Liberius, and of the council of Nice, the practice of the church of Rome, and that of all other churches both in the east and west.<sup>2</sup> Isidorus of Seville takes particular notice of this point of discipline, which he says was established by the letter of Syricius.<sup>3</sup> By the second article he forbids the sacrament of baptism to be administered at Christmas, or the Epiphany, on the feasts of the apostle or martyrs, or at any other time but Easter, and during the Pentecost of that festival, meaning, in all likelihood, at Easter time, or the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsuntide; for such, adds he, is the practice of the church of Rome, and of all other churches. From this rule, however, he excepts children, and all persons, who are any ways in danger.<sup>4</sup> By the third article, he forbids granting the grace of reconciliation to apostates, that is, forgiving and readmitting them to the communion of the church, except at the point of death.<sup>5</sup> By the fourth, a woman, who, being betrothed to one man, has received the priest's blessing to marry him, is debarred from marrying another. The fifth article commands all persons, who, being guilty of a crime, have performed penance for it, to be treated as the apostates, if they relapse into the same crime; and the sixth, all religious persons,

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. Anast. 6. 29. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. <sup>2</sup> Vide Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. <sup>3</sup> Id. ib. n. 6.

\* Damasus died on the 10th or 11th of December 384, as I have related before; and Syricius was chosen the same year, as we read in the Chronicle of Prosper. Anastasius therefore, and the author of the Pontifical published by Bollandus, as well as Baronius, were certainly mistaken in affirming, upon what grounds I know not, that, upon the death of Damasus, the see remained vacant for the space of 31 or 36 days. (a)

(a) Anast. p. 21. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. Bar. ib. n. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 1. p. 69. 689—691.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 689.

<sup>3</sup> Isid. ser. c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Con. ib.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. p. 690.



Priests and deacons obliged to observe celibacy. The celibacy of the clergy first proposed in the council of Elvira.

whether men or women, guilty of fornication, to be dealt with in the same manner, and, moreover, to be excluded from partaking of the sacred mysteries, that is, of the eucharist, except at the point of death.<sup>1</sup> How different is the present practice of the church of Rome from that of the same church in the fourth century! which was perhaps even too severe.

Syricius, by the seventh article of his letter, obliges all priests and deacons to observe celibacy: and as some had not paid due obedience to that command of the church, he allows those who should acknowledge their fault, and plead ignorance, to continue in their rank, though without hopes of rising: but as for those who should presume to defend this abuse as lawful, he declares them deposed and degraded from the rank they held in the church:<sup>2</sup> Pope Innocent I. writing to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, quotes and transcribes great part of this article.<sup>3</sup> The eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh articles describe at length the life which those ought to have led, who are raised by the clergy and people to the episcopal dignity, and the steps or degrees by which they should ascend to it. They ought first to have been readers; at the age of thirty, acolytes, subdeacons, and deacons; five years after, presbyters; and in that degree they were to continue ten years before they could be chosen bishops. Those who had been married to two wives, or to a widow, are absolutely excluded from ever sitting in the episcopal see. Even the lectors are forbidden, on pain of deposition, to marry twice, or to marry a widow.<sup>4</sup> These, and several other less important regulations, Syricius delivers as general rules to be inviolably observed by all churches, often declaring, that those who do not readily comply with them shall be separated from his communion by the sentence of a synod, and strictly enjoining the chief prelates of each province to take care they be punctually observed within the bounds of their respective jurisdictions, on pain of being deposed, and treated as they deserve. He therefore desires Himerius to notify his letter, not only to all the bishops of his diocese or province, but likewise to those of Carthage, Bætica, Lusitania, Galicia, and to all the neighbouring bishops, meaning perhaps those of Gaul; for Innocent I. supposes the decrees of his predecessor Syricius to be known to Exuperius of Toulouse;<sup>5</sup> and in all likelihood they were so to others in that country.

This letter is the first of all the decretals acknowledged, by the learned, to be genuine, and likewise the first in all the ancient collections of the canons of the Latin church. It is quoted by Innocent I. and Isidore of Seville, and is the only letter of the many ascribed to Syricius, that Dionysius Exiguus

has inserted in his collection. It is to be found in Father Quesnel's Roman code;<sup>1</sup> and Cresconius quotes no other decrees of Syricius but what are taken from this letter. It is dated the third of the ides of February, that is, the eleventh of that month, 385. Arcadius and Bauto being consuls.\*

As priests and deacons are commanded, by the seventh article of this letter, to abstain from marriage, and this is the first opportunity that has offered of mentioning the celibacy of the clergy, a short digression on such a material point of discipline in the church may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to the reader. The laying of this heavy burden on the shoulders of the clergy, a burden too heavy for most of them to bear, as experience has shown, was first moved in the council of Elvira, held about the year 300, according to the most probable opinion; and, being warmly promoted by the celebrated Osius of Cordoua, and Felix of Acci, now Guadix in Andalusia, who presided at that assembly, it passed into a law; and all bishops, presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, were commanded on pain of deposition, "to abstain from wives, and the begetting of children." These are the very words of the 33d canon of that council.<sup>2</sup> That, till this time, the clergy were allowed to marry, even in Spain, is manifest from the 65th canon of the same council, excluding from the communion of the church, even at the point of death, such ecclesiastics, as, knowing their wives to be guilty of adultery, should not, upon the first notice of their crime, immediately turn them out of doors.<sup>3</sup> How long the 33d canon continued in vigor, is uncertain; nay, it may be questioned whether it ever took place: if ever it did, it was out of date, or at least not generally observed by the Spanish clergy, in the time of Syricius, as evidently appears from the words of his letter, or answer to Himerius of Tarragon: I said, by the Spanish clergy; for no such injunction had yet been laid on the ecclesiastics of any other country or nation. About

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Rom. a Ques. cum Leone edit. c. 29.

\* The Jesuit Papebrok highly extols this letter, (a) but, at the same time, does not think it quite pure and genuine, because the date, says he, has been added to it; for the other letters of Syricius, and likewise those of his predecessors, bear no date. But can we conclude from thence, that they never had any? Some of the letters of Innocent I. are dated, and some without a date, and he admits both. The transcribers contented themselves, for the most part, with copying the body of the letter, and neglected the rest. Papebrok adds, that the date ought to have been expressed thus: "Arcadio Aug. et Bauto viro clar. Cons.", and not "Arcadio et Bauto viris clarissimis," as it is in that letter. But might not this mistake be owing to the ignorance of the transcribers, who, finding, in the original, only the two letters, V. C. which are to be met with in many ancient writings, set down "viris clarissimis," instead of "viro clarissimo?" Papebrok must have observed the same mistake in the letter, which Pope Innocent I. wrote to the council of Milevum, (b) and which he allows to be altogether genuine. For slips or oversights of this nature, hardly avoidable, no piece ought to be condemned, or even suspected.

(a) Bolland. prop. p. 56.

(b) Concil. t. 2. p. 1289.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 1. p. 1210.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. p. 1329.

<sup>1</sup> Con. ib. p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 689, 690.

<sup>3</sup> Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. & p. 691.

<sup>5</sup> Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.



The present practice of the church of Rome, with respect to this point.

fifteen years after, was held the council of Ancyra, in which it was decreed, that "if any deacon did not declare at his ordination, that he designed to marry, he ought not to be allowed to marry after; but might, if he made such a declaration, because, in that case, the bishop tacitly consented to it." The council of Neocæsarea, which assembled soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted, in great part, of the same bishops, commanded "such presbyters as married after their ordination to be degraded." In the year 325, was held the council of Nice; and, in that great assembly, it was moved, perhaps by Osius, who acted a chief part there, that bishops, presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, should be debarred from all commerce with the wives they had married before their ordination. But this motion was warmly opposed by Paphnutius, who had himself ever led a chaste and single life, and was one of the most eminent and illustrious prelates, at that time, in the church. He represented, that the burden they proposed laying on the clergy, was too heavy; that few had sufficient strength to bear it; that the women, thus abandoned by their husbands, would be exposed to great dangers; that marriage was no pollution, but, according to St. Paul, commendable; that those, therefore, who were not married, when first admitted to the sacerdotal functions, should continue in that state; and such as were, should continue to live with their wives. Thus Sozomen,<sup>1</sup> Socrates,<sup>2</sup> and Suidas.<sup>3</sup>(\*)

The advice of Paphnutius was applauded by the whole assembly, and the above-mentioned historians, and the point in dispute was left undecided. In the year 340, it was decreed, in the council of Arles, that no man, encumbered with a wife, should be admitted to holy orders, unless he promised, with his wife's approbation and consent, to abstain for ever from the conjugal duty.

This is all I can find in the ancient records concerning the continence or celibacy of the clergy, before the time of Syricius. And hence it is manifest, that both Crichtonæus and Melancthon were greatly mistaken; the former in affirming, which many have done after him, that celibacy was first imposed

upon the clergy by Syricius;<sup>1</sup> and the latter by confidently asserting, that celibacy was not required of the ministers of the gospel by any council, but by the popes, in opposition to all councils and synods.<sup>2</sup> It must be owned, however, that this law was not so generally observed before the time of Syricius, as it was after. For it was not long after his time before it became an established point of discipline in most of the western churches, not in virtue of his letter, or of those which his successor wrote to the same purpose, but because it was enjoined by the synods of each particular nation. Thus it was established in Africa by the council of Carthage in 390, in Gaul by one held at Orleans, by two at Tours, and one at Agde; in Spain, by three held at Toledo; in Germany, by the councils of Aquisgranum, or Aix la Chapelle, of Worms, and of Mentz. We know of none in Britain: and that it did not even begin to take place here till the arrival of Austin, in the sixth century, may be sufficiently proved from the letters of that monk to Gregory, and Gregory's answer to him; but of that more hereafter. (\*)

As to the present practice and doctrine of the church of Rome, with respect to this, in their opinion, most essential point of ecclesiastical discipline, no man is allowed, after his ordination, to marry, or to cohabit with the wife he had married before: nay, in order to prevent all possible means even of any clandestine commerce between them, the woman must, by a solemn vow of chastity, renounce all claims on her husband, and retiring into a monastery, bind herself by a second vow to continue there, without ever once going out, on any pretence whatsoever, so long as her husband lives, who cannot be admitted so much as to the rank of a subdeacon, till she is secured by these two vows. Such is the present practice of the church of Rome,

<sup>1</sup> Cricht. de contin. sacerdot. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Melanc. in Apol. p. 13.

(\*) I cannot forbear taking notice here of an inexcusable mistake in the ecclesiastical history of England, by Nicolas Harpsfield, archdeacon of Canterbury, a work in great request abroad. That writer tells us, that Restitutus, bishop of London, assisted at the council of Arles, and signed the above-mentioned canon, forbidding a man encumbered with a wife to be admitted to orders, unless he promised, with her consent, to refrain from all commerce with her after his ordination. He leaves us to infer from thence, that this canon was received in Britain. (a) But surely Harpsfield must never have seen either the subscriptions, or the acts of that council. Had he seen the subscriptions, he had hardly omitted two British bishops out of three. For, besides the name of Restitutus, I find among the subscriptions, the names of Adelphus de colonia Londinensium, that is, as is commonly believed of Colchester, and of Hibernus of Eboracum, or York. Had he seen the acts, he had never been guilty of such a gross mistake as to ascribe the above mentioned canon to the council of Arles, at which Restitutus assisted; since that council was held against the Donatists of Africa, in the year 314, and not the least mention was made there of the celibacy of the clergy. (b) The second council of Arles was held about twenty-six years after, and of that council the said canon is the second.

(a) Harp. Hist. Eccles. (b) Concil. t. 1. p. 1426—Anglican. p. 26. 1429.

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 1. c. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 1. c. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Suid. in vit. Paph.

(\*) I am not unapprised, that this account is rejected by Baronius, (a) and Bellarmine, (b) as fabulous; but, notwithstanding the pains they have both taken to make it appear incredible, F. Lupus allows it to be true, (c) though a no less zealous stickler for the discipline of the church of Rome than either of them. Ruffinus, I own, takes no notice of this transaction, as Valesius well observes. But has no true transaction been, either wilfully or ignorantly, omitted by that writer? Valesius well knows, that many have; and had he perused that author with a little more attention, he would not have so positively affirmed, that no one ever named Paphnutius among the bishops of Egypt, who assisted at the Council of Nice, since he is named among them by Ruffinus, and with great commendations. (d)

(a) Bar. ad ann. 58. n. 21.

(b) Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.

(c) Lup. in can. p. 114.

(d) Ruf. l. 1. c. 4.



In the primitive church, married and unmarried men raised indiscriminately to ecclesiastical dignities. Celibacy recommended by the fathers: never enjoined by the apostles.

though subdeacons were allowed to marry long after the time of Syricius, who, in his letter, mentions only deacons and presbyters, and does not even oblige them to part with their wives, but only excludes them from rising to a higher degree in the church. Pope Leo the Great, chosen in 440, was the first who extended the law of celibacy to the subdeacons, commanding them, in a letter, which he wrote about the year 442, to Rusticus bishop of Narbonne, to abstain, as well as the deacons, presbyters, and bishops, from all commerce with their wives. But this law was observed by very few churches. In the time of pope Gregory the Great, that is in the latter end of the sixth century, it had not yet taken place, even in Sicily, though reckoned among the suburbicarian provinces: it was first introduced into that island by him; but he allowed those to cohabit with their wives, who had been ordained without a previous promise to live continent, though he would not suffer them to be raised to a higher degree without such a promise. Bellarmine,<sup>1</sup> and the other divines of the church of Rome, to soften the odium, which the hard, and commonly impracticable command she lays on her clergy, must reflect on her, represent continency as a virtue to be easily acquired. Their ascetics seem better acquainted with the difficulties and struggles attending the practice of that virtue, than their divines; for they prescribe, as the sole means of attaining it, constant prayer, frequent fasting, macerating the rebelling flesh with all kinds of austerities, and principally the avoiding of all female company. And, if these be the sole means of attaining it, I leave the reader to judge how few of their clergy do attain it.

No one is so little versed in the history of the church, as not to know, that in the first three centuries of the Christian religion, married and unmarried men were indiscriminately raised to the episcopal, and every other ecclesiastical dignity; nay, Jerom writes, that in his time, that is, in the fourth century, the former were, for the most part, preferred to the latter, not in regard of their greater merit, but because, in such elections, the unmarried men were outnumbered by the married, who chose to be governed by one in their own station of life.<sup>2</sup> It is hence manifest, that marriage was not thought, in Jerom's time, inconsistent with, or any bar to, the episcopal dignity. And why should it? since, excepting St. John, the apostles themselves were all married, as we are told, in express terms, by Ignatius the Martyr,<sup>3</sup> who was their cotemporary and disciple, and whose authority ought, on that consideration, to be of greater weight than that of all the other fathers together. "But such of the primitive clergy," says Bellar-

mine,<sup>1</sup> "as were married before their ordination, abstained ever after from the use of matrimony: let our adversaries produce, if they can, but a single evidence of a presbyter or bishop's having any commerce with their wives." It lies upon him to show they had not. We know nothing to the contrary, and therefore may well suppose, that pursuant to the advice given by the apostle to all husbands and wives, "they came together," after ordination as they did before, "lest Satan should tempt them for their incontinency."

The fathers, it is true, out of a mistaken notion of an extraordinary merit attending celibacy in this life, and an extraordinary reward reserved for it in the other, began very early to recommend it to persons of all ranks and stations, but more especially to the clergy, as the principal excellence and perfection of a Christian. By their exhortations, and the praises they were constantly bestowing on virginity, celibacy, and continence, many among the clergy, and even some of the laity, were wrought up to such a pitch of enthusiasm, as to mutilate themselves, thinking they could by no other means be sufficiently qualified for the unnatural, but meritorious, state of celibacy. And, what is very surprising, this practice became so common in the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century, that the fathers of Nice were obliged to restrain it by a particular canon. They enacted one accordingly, excluding for ever from the priesthood, such "as should make themselves eunuchs, the preservation of their life or health not requiring such a mutilation." By the same canon they deposed and degraded all, who should thus maim themselves after their ordination.<sup>2</sup> But though the fathers warmly recommended celibacy to the unmarried clergy, and continence to the married, neither was looked upon as an obligation, till late in the fourth century, and not even then in all places; for Epiphanius, who lived till the beginning of the fifth, writes, that though "men still begetting children" were excluded by the ecclesiastical canons from every dignity and degree in the church, yet they were in some places admitted as subdeacons, deacons, and presbyters, because those canons were not yet universally observed;<sup>3</sup> so that, according to Epiphanius, it was not by the apostles (as the divines of the church of Rome pretend), but by the ecclesiastical canons, that this obligation was laid on the clergy; and, in his time, those canons were not yet universally complied with, nor indeed many ages after: nay, in the Greek church, the clergy are to this day allowed to cohabit with the wives they married before their ordination; and, in this kingdom, celibacy was not uni-

<sup>1</sup> Bellar. de cler. l. 1. c. 21. <sup>2</sup> Hier. in Jovin. l. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Ign. ep. ad Philadelp.

<sup>1</sup> Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. l. 2. p. 28, 29. Ambr. ep. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Epiph. hæres. 59.



Celibacy deemed by the pagans the highest degree of sanctity. The celibacy of the clergy a bad institution. Another letter of Syricius.

versally established till after the conquest, as I shall have occasion to show in the sequel of the present history.

The abstaining from lawful, as well as unlawful pleasures, was deemed, by the ancient pagans, especially in the east, the highest degree of sanctity and perfection. Hence some of their priests, in compliance with this notion, and to recommend themselves to the esteem of the people, did not only profess, promise, and vow an eternal abstinence from all pleasures of that nature, as those of the church of Rome do, but put it out of their power ever to enjoy them. Thus the priests of "Cybele, by becoming priests ceased to be men," to borrow the expression of Jerom; and the Hierophantes, who were the first ministers of religion among the Athenians, rendered themselves equally incapable of transgressing the vows they had made, by constantly drinking the cold juice of hemlock.<sup>1</sup> A stoic, called Cheremon, introduced by Jerom to describe the lives of the Egyptian priests, tells us, among other things, that, from the time they addicted themselves to the service of the gods, they renounced all intercourse and commerce with women; and, the better to conquer their natural inclinations, abstained altogether from meat and wine. Several other instances might be alleged to show that celibacy was embraced and practised by the pagan priests, long before the birth of the Christian religion; and, consequently, that it was not religion, but superstition, that first laid the priesthood under such an obligation. The church of Rome has borrowed, as is notorious, several ceremonies, customs, and practices of the pagans, and perhaps the celibacy of the priesthood among the rest: I say, perhaps, because it might have been suggested to her by the same spirit of superstition that suggested it to them: for wherever the same spirit prevails, it will ever operate in the same manner, and be attended with the same, or the like effects. Thus we find the same austerities practised by the pagans in the East Indies, and other idolatrous nations, that are practised and recommended by the church of Rome; and yet no man can imagine those austerities to have been by either borrowed of the other. There is almost an entire conformity between the laws, discipline, and hierarchy of the ancient druids, and the present Roman catholic clergy; nay, the latter claim the very same privileges, prerogatives, and exemptions, as were claimed and enjoyed by the former:<sup>2</sup> and yet we cannot well suppose them to have been guided therein by their example. Celibacy was discountenanced by the Romans, who nevertheless had their vestals, instituted by their second king at a time when, the new city being yet then thinly inhabited, marriage

ought in both sexes to have been most encouraged: and the same spirit, which suggested to that superstitious prince the institution of the vestals, suggested the like institutions to other pagan nations, and to the church at Rome that of so many different orders of nuns.

How much better had the church of Rome consulted her own reputation, had she either, in opposition to the pagan priesthood, allowed her clergy the use of matrimony, or, by a more perfect imitation of their discipline, with the law of celibacy, prescribed the like methods of observing it! How many enormities had been prevented by either of these means, the world knows. But none of her clergy have the observance of their vows so much at heart as to imitate either the Athenian or the Egyptian priests: and as for those of Cybele, they are so far from conforming to their practice, that a law subjecting them to it has kept them out of protestant kingdoms, when the fear of death could not.

If every law or institution is to be judged good or evil, according to the good and evil attending them, it is by daily experience but too manifest, that the forced celibacy of the clergy ought to be deemed of all institutions the very worst. Indeed all sensible men of that church know and lament the innumerable evils which the celibacy of her clergy occasions, and must always occasion, in spite of all remedies that can be applied to it. But she finds one advantage in it, which, in her eyes, makes more than sufficient amends for all those evils, namely, her engrossing by that means to herself all the thoughts and attention of her clergy, which, were they allowed to marry, would be divided between her and their families, and each of them would have a separate interest from that of the church. Several customs and practices, once warmly espoused by that church, have, in process of time, been abrogated, and quite laid aside, on account of the inconveniences attending them; and this, which long experience has shown to be attended with more pernicious consequences than any other, had, but for that political view, been likewise abolished.

Another letter, universally ascribed to Syricius, has reached our times. It is written in a very perplexed and obscure style; bears no date; is not to be found either in Dionysius Exiguus, or any ancient code; and is addressed to "all the orthodox dwelling in different provinces:"<sup>1</sup> which is manifestly a mistake, since Syricius desires those, to whom it is addressed, to confirm it with their subscriptions, which cannot be understood but of bishops. However, as it is received by all as genuine, I shall not take it upon me to reject it as spurious. The subject of this letter is the ordination of the ministers of the church; and the first article is against those who pre-

<sup>1</sup> Hier. l. 2. in Jov.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Cæs. comm. de bell. Gall. l. 6. Cic. div. l. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1028.



Jerom retires from Rome. The usurper Maximus writes to Syricius.

tend to pass from the vanities of the world to the episcopal dignity. Syricius writes, that they came often to him, attended with numerous retinues, begging him to ordain them; but that they had never been able to prevail upon him to grant them their request. In the second article he complains of the monks, who were constantly wandering about the country, and on whom the bishops chose rather to confer holy orders, and the episcopal dignity itself, than to relieve them with alms. The third and last article forbids a layman or neophyte to be ordained either deacon or presbyter. If this letter be genuine, Syricius was the first bishop of Rome who styled himself pope, as Papebrok well observes;<sup>1</sup> for the title of his letter, as transmitted to us, runs thus; "Pope Syricius to the orthodox," &c. The word imports no more than father, and it was anciently given, out of respect, to all bishops, as I have observed elsewhere; but I have found none before Syricius who distinguished themselves with that title.

Jerom continued at Rome some months after the death of his great patron Damasus. But, finding himself obnoxious to the Roman clergy, for the liberty he had taken in some of his writings to censure their effeminate and licentious lives, and, on the other hand, not being countenanced and supported by Syricius, as he had been by his predecessor, he thought it advisable to abandon that city, and return to Palæstine. Some pretend, but without sufficient authority, that Syricius joined the rest in reviling and persecuting him.

Baronius has inserted, in his *Annals*,<sup>2</sup> a letter from the usurper Maximus, who reigned in Gaul; from which we learn that Syricius had written first to him, exhorting him to continue steady in the catholic faith, being, perhaps, apprehensive lest he should suffer himself to be imposed upon by the Priscillianists, who were very numerous in Gaul; and complaining to him of the undue ordination of a presbyter named Agrius. Maximus, in his answer, pretends great zeal for the true faith, and promises to assemble the bishops of Gaul, and of the five provinces, meaning Gallia Narbonensis, to examine the affair of Agrius. He assures Syricius, that he has nothing so much at heart as to maintain the catholic faith pure and uncorrupted, to see a perfect harmony established among the prelates of the church, and to suppress the many disorders which had prevailed at the time of his accession to the empire, and would have soon proved incurable, had they been neglected. He adds, that many shocking abominations of the Manichees, meaning no doubt the Priscillianists, had been discovered, not by groundless conjectures and surmises, but by their own confession before the magistrates,

as Syricius might learn from the acts. For Maximus caused the ringleaders of that sect to be put to death this very year, convicted before the magistrates of the grossest immoralities.\* These were Priscillian himself, Felicissimus, and Armenus, two ecclesiastics, who had but very lately embraced his doctrine; Asarinus and Aurelius, two deacons; Latronianus, or, as Jerom calls him, Matronianus, a layman; and Euchrocia, the widow of the orator Delphidius, who had professed eloquence in the city of Bourdeaux a few years before. These were, by the order of Maximus, all beheaded this year at Treves. The rest of Priscillian's followers, whom they could discover and apprehend, were either banished or confined.

But these severities served only to increase

\* The first author of this sect was one Mark, a native of Memphis in Egypt, a famous magician, and once a follower of the doctrine of the Manichees. (a) From Egypt he travelled into Spain, where he had for his disciples a woman of quality named Agapa, Elpidius the rhetorician, and Agagius. (b) Priscillian, of whom I shall speak hereafter, was the disciple and successor of the two latter. Jerom tells us, upon the authority of Irenæus, whom he quotes, that Mark passed from the banks of the Rhone into Aquitaine, and from thence into Spain; (c) which made Baronius write, that he first infected Gaul. (d) But no such thing was ever affirmed by Irenæus; and besides, Jerom confounds the sect of the Marcosians with that of the Priscillianists, and the author of the former, who was contemporary with Irenæus, with the author of the latter, who lived in the fourth century.

The Priscillianists broached no new doctrine, but formed a new sect, by adopting every impious opinion that had been broached by others; whence their sect is styled by Austin, the common sink of all other heresies. (e) By their external behavior, which was extremely modest and composed, they gained many followers, whom, by degrees, they let into the abominations of their sect; for there was no lewdness which they did not encourage and practice, rejecting matrimony for no other reason, but because it confined a man to one woman, and a woman to one man. (f) They held it no crime to speak contrary to what they thought and believed, and to confirm with an oath what they said when they were talking to people of a different persuasion. This was one of their favorite maxims, which above all others they took care to inculcate to their proselytes, often repeating to them, and among themselves, the famous verse;

Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli.

Swear, foreswear, but never betray a secret. (g)

Hence it was no easy matter to discover them; for they mixed with the orthodox at Divine service, received the sacraments of the church, and disowned, with the most solemn oaths, the doctrines which they had been heard by many to utter and teach. (h) To this sect Priscillian, who gave name to it, was gained by the above-mentioned Elpidius and Agagius. He was a man of birth and fortune, being descended of an ancient and illustrious family of Spain, and is said to have been endowed with extraordinary parts, and well versed in every branch of learning; so that many were induced by his example to embrace the new sect, and more by his eloquence; for he had a particular gift of speaking well, and gaining the affections of all who heard him. (i) Among his followers were several persons of the first rank, both men and women, and even some bishops, namely, Vegetinus, Symphosius, Instantius, and Salvianus, of whom the two latter entered into an indissoluble league and alliance with him. (k)

(a) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Isid. *Hisp. de Scrip. eccles.* c. 2. (b) Id. ib. (c) Hier. ep. 29.

(d) Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 113, 114.

(e) Aug. *hær.* 70. p. 13. (f) Id. ib. & Leo, ep. 93.

(g) Aug. ib. ep. 253. & ad Con. c. 2. (h) Id. ib.

(i) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Hier. in Isai. 64. p. 240.

(k) Sulp. ib. p. 171. Concil. i. l. p. 741.

<sup>1</sup> Bolland. prop. p. 213.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 387. n. 65, 66. ex. t. 1, ep. Rom. Pont. p. 48.



They are honored by their followers as saints and martyrs. Many embrace their doctrine. Two of their leading men renounce their errors; and are admitted to the communion of the church by the council of Toledo. The acts of that council confirmed by St. Ambrose and Syricius. Dictinius honored as a saint. Priscillian honored as a saint and a martyr.

the evil which they were employed to cure. The bodies of Priscillian, and of those who had suffered with him, were conveyed by their friends and adherents into Spain, and there interred with great pomp and solemnity; their names were added to those of other saints and martyrs, their firmness and constancy extolled, and their doctrine embraced by such numbers of proselytes, that it spread in a short time over all the provinces between the Pyrenees and the ocean.<sup>1</sup> Symphosius, metropolitan of Galicia, whom, after the death of Priscillian, they looked upon as the chief man and head of their sect, took care to fill all the vacant sees in that province with bishops of his own communion. Dictinius, whom he raised among the rest to that dignity, is supposed by St. Austin<sup>2</sup> to have been the author of a book, famous in those times, styled *Libra*, or, the Pound.\* However, both he and Symphosius were afterwards convinced of their errors; and, desiring thereupon to be reconciled with the church, they undertook a journey to Milan, in order to engage St. Ambrose, bishop of that city, in their favor. He received them with the greatest marks of kindness and affection; and being satisfied with the terms of reconciliation, which they themselves proposed, and promised to observe, he wrote in their behalf to the bishops of Spain, who, at his request, admitted them to their communion.<sup>3</sup> †

In the year 438, of the Spanish, and 400, of the common era, a council was held at Toledo; and, in the presence of that assembly, Symphosius, Dictinius, and Comasus, one of Symphosius' presbyters, solemnly abjured the errors of Priscillian, anathematized the doctrine, sect,

and books of that heretic, and readily signed the confession of faith which the council had drawn up. Their example was followed by three other bishops, namely, Paternus, Isonius, and Vegetinus, who were all admitted to the communion of the church, and even allowed to keep their sees, though unduly preferred, "on condition the bishops of Rome and Milan should consent thereto, and restore them to the peace of the church."<sup>1</sup> From these words, which are the very words of the council, it is manifest, first, that the fathers, who composed that assembly, were strangers to the bishop of Rome's universal jurisdiction; and, secondly, that the bishop of Milan did not act, as Baronius pretends, on that occasion as the pope's legate. Their requiring the approbation of the bishop of Milan, besides that of the bishop of Rome, sufficiently proves the one; and their requiring the approbation of the bishop of Rome, besides that of the bishop of Milan, the other.

Four other bishops, namely, Herenius, Donatus, Acurius, and Æmilius, could by no means be induced to follow the example of Symphosius and Dictinius; and were thereupon deposed by the council, and cut off from the communion of the catholic church. The bishops of Rome and Milan not only confirmed the acts of the council with respect to Symphosius and Dictinius, but separated themselves from the communion of the bishops of Bætica and the Carthageneſe, who, thinking the council had dealt too favorably with them, refused to admit them to their communion.<sup>2</sup> Dictinius died in 420, and is now honored in Spain as a saint, though it may be justly questioned whether he deserves that honor. Idatius the chronologist, who was a native of Spain, and raised there to the episcopal dignity about the year 428, mentions him without saying any thing in his praise, or taking the least notice of his being honored then as a saint. St. Austin speaks doubtfully even of his conversion,<sup>3</sup> and at the same time tells us, that his book was highly esteemed by the Priscillianists, and his memory no less revered; which, notwithstanding the eminent sanctity ascribed to him by Baronius,<sup>4</sup> gives us room to suspect, that the honor now paid him is owing to a tradition handed down by the Priscillianists. For thus was Priscillian himself once revered both as a saint and a martyr. Nay, the author of the notes on Sulpitius Severus assures us, that he has seen his name in some, not very ancient, martyrologies; and Petrus de Natalibus has allowed, both to him, and to Latronianus, who suffered with him, a place among the martyrs of the church, pretending to be countenanced therein by the authority of Jerom.<sup>5</sup> And truly it must be owned, that

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ep. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ad Con. c. 3.

\* It was so called because it contained twelve questions, as the Roman pound did twelve ounces. In that piece the author endeavored to prove, from the practice of the patriarchs, of the prophets, apostles, angels, and of Christ himself, that a lie could be no crime, when uttered to conceal our religion. (a)

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 1. p. 742. ed. Binian.

† That these two bishops should have applied to St. Ambrose, and not to Syricius, is what Baronius cannot brook; and therefore to bring in, right or wrong, the bishop of Rome, he quotes a passage of the council of Toledo, where the fathers of that assembly, speaking of the letter which St. Ambrose had written in favor of Symphosius and Dictinius, adds the following words in a parenthesis; "Which things were likewise suggested by pope Syricius of holy memory. (b) But as these words have no manner of connexion with the rest, it is manifest they have been foisted in on purpose to bring Syricius upon the stage; and were we to admit them as genuine, we could only conclude from thence, that Syricius too had written to the bishops of Spain in behalf of Symphosius and Dictinius. Baronius indeed goes a great way farther; for he infers from the above-mentioned words, that St. Ambrose acted by the advice and direction of Syricius; and from thence by a second inference, which could occur to none but himself, that both Ambrose, and Simplicius, who succeeded him in the see of Milan, were the pope's legates. (c) It is by such far-fetched inferences and deductions that he endeavors, throughout his voluminous performance, to mislead his unwary readers into a belief of the pope's supremacy.

(a) Id. ib. c. 2, & 18.

(b) Concil. t. 2. p. 1230.

(c) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 54.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 1. p. 742.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1279.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ad Conc. c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 56.

<sup>5</sup> Pet. de Natal. l. 11. c. 89.



The doctrine of the Priscillianists takes deep root in Spain. Council assembled by Syricius at Rome.

Jerom, in the year 392, writ very favorably of Priscillian. "He was executed," says he, "by the faction of Ithacius, being accused by some as if he had embraced the heresy of the gnostics; but others maintained, that he held not the doctrine and tenets with which he was charged."<sup>1</sup> But being afterwards better informed, he styles him an execrable man,<sup>2</sup> and condemns his doctrine as an infamous heresy, as a plague and contagion, that cruelly ravaged most of the Spanish provinces.<sup>3</sup> It is not therefore without reason that the church of Rome now anathematizes, as a heretic, the man she once revered as a saint. Such has been the fate of many others, judged by Baronius himself unworthy of the worship that was paid them, and therefore set aside, when, by the command of Gregory XIII. he revised and corrected the Roman Martyrology. As for Dictinius, he has not yet been driven out of heaven, though nobody can well tell how he came in. 'Tis true, both he and Symphosius are styled bishops of holy memory, in the abstract of the council of Toledo, which is supposed to have been done about the year 447. This is all Baronius can plead in favor of his eminent sanctity. A poor charter indeed to hold a place in heaven by, and claim the worship and honors attending it! For the author of that abstract is utterly unknown; and, besides, he canonizes alike Symphosius and Dictinius, styling them both bishops of holy memory. Why then should his authority have so much weight with respect to the one, and none at all in regard of the other? If we bar prescription, which surely can have no room here, Dictinius can have no more right to keep the place he has, than Symphosius to claim the place he has not. Nay, the latter would have a far better right, were it true, that Dictinius relapsed into the errors he had abjured, and was on that account deposed with several other bishops of his sect. This I read in an author of great note;<sup>4</sup> but as he advances it upon the authority of another, namely, of Idatius the chronologist, and the passage he quotes is not to be found in that writer, at least in the editions I have perused, it would be both unjust and ungenerous to deprive Dictinius of, or disturb him in, the possession of his saintship upon such an evidence.

Syricius and Ambrose, in conjunction with the catholic bishops of Spain, alarmed at the wonderful progress the doctrine of Priscillian had made in so short a time, left nothing unattempted they could think of to put a stop to the growing evil. But all to no purpose; in spite of their utmost efforts, in defiance of the most severe laws, that were enacted against them, especially by the emperors Honorius, and Theodosius the younger, their numbers increased daily, and their doctrine grew daily more popular; the severities that were prac-

tised against them, serving only to recommend those to the esteem and veneration of the multitude, who suffered them, as many did, with patience and constancy. As they held it lawful to conceal their real sentiments from the catholics, by disowning them with the most solemn oaths; the catholics suffered themselves to be led by a mistaken zeal into the same error, disowning, in like manner, their sentiments, the better to discover those of their adversaries. But this pernicious practice of defending truth by destroying it, and opposing lies by lying, was fully and unanswerably confuted by Austin, in his answer to Consentius, who had written to him at length on that subject.<sup>1</sup>(\*)

The indefatigable pains Syricius took, together with the other catholic bishops, in suppressing the heresy of the Priscillianists, proved quite unsuccessful, though seconded by the secular power, and the severest laws that had yet been enacted against heretics. Their doctrine rather gained, than lost ground; and we shall find them in the sixth century, that is, two hundred years hence, still a numerous sect, and councils assembling, to very little purpose, against them. Syricius was not so intent, as we are told, upon maintaining the doctrine of the church, as to neglect the discipline. In order to correct several abuses, that had begun to prevail, and revive some ancient constitutions, that were grown out of use, he convened a council at Rome, which is said to have consisted of eighty bishops; and, with their consent and approbation, established the following canons: 1. That no one should presume to ordain a bishop, without the knowledge of the apostolic see. 2. That no man should be admitted to the ecclesiastical order, who, after the remission of his sins, that is, perhaps, after his baptism, had worn the sword of worldly warfare. 3. That no clerk should marry a widow. 4. That the Novatians and Montanists, that is, Donatists, should be received into the church by the imposition of hands; but that

<sup>1</sup> Aug. ad Con. contra mendac. per totum.

\* The doctrine of the church of Rome, concerning equivocations, mental reservations, and the lawfulness, or rather obligation, of concealing, with the most solemn oaths, what has been revealed under the seal of confession, has perhaps some affinity with the doctrine of the Priscillianists. What is only known under the seal of confession, say their divines, is not known to man, but to God alone, since it was not discovered to a man, but to God represented by a man, that is, to the priest or confessor; and therefore, the priest may, with a safe conscience, affirm, even upon oath, that he knows not what he thus knew. It is by recurring to this doctrine, that F. Daniel Bartoli, in his history of England, or rather of the Jesuits in England, endeavors to justify the conduct of the Jesuit Garnet, in not discovering the gunpowder plot, to which he supposes him to have been privy: but as it was disclosed to him in confession, or at least under the seal of confession, he had sinned grievously by discovering it, though by such a discovery he might have saved a whole nation from destruction. (a) So that the violating such a seal is a far greater evil than the loss of so many lives, than the utter ruin of an entire nation. A doctrine evidently repugnant to the dictates both of reason and humanity.

(a) Bar. hist. d'Inghilterra.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. vir. iii. c. 121.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Cte. t. 2. p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ep. 82. 29. in Isai. c. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Leo, t. p. 831.



such as, abandoning the catholic faith, had been rebaptized by them, should not be re-admitted without performing a long penance. 5. That the priests and deacons should live continent, being, by their office, daily employed in the divine ministry.<sup>1</sup> These canons or decrees, say the Roman catholic divines, are contained in a letter, which Syricius wrote to the bishop of Africa, and which was read, and received as a law, by a council held some years after at Tela, in the province of Byzacene, as appears from the acts of that council.<sup>2</sup> Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, in his abridgment of the canons, done in the sixth century, often quotes the letter of Syricius, and takes particular notice of the canons that were copied from it by the council of Tela. The same letter, together with the acts of that council, are to be found, word for word, in the ancient code of the church of Rome. So that, upon the whole, we cannot question, says Baronius, the authenticity of that piece, without rendering the authority of every other monument of antiquity quite precarious, and leaving men to their own wild and groundless conjectures. But men of learning have, of late years, been too much upon their guard to admit, without the strictest examination, any piece, however authentic in appearance, that seemed to countenance the extraordinary power and authority claimed by the bishop of Rome. And not without reason, since they well knew what pains had been taken to banish truth, by suppressing or adulterating the most authentic records, and to establish falsehood, by substituting in their room fabulous legends, spurious letters, and acts of councils that never were held. As for the letter ascribed to Syricius, it has been suspected ever since criticism took place,<sup>3</sup> and lately rejected as unquestionably supposititious, by F. Quesnel, who, in a learned dissertation on that subject, proves, in my opinion, unanswerably, not only the letter, but the acts of the pretended council of Tela, to have been forged, and inserted, in latter times, into the collection of Ferrandus, and the Roman code.<sup>4</sup>(\*)

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1028—1030.    <sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1578.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Blond. censur. in decretal. epist. 550.

<sup>4</sup> Quesn. dissert. 5. sur S. Leon.

(\*) To convince the reader of this double forgery, I need not refer him to that judicious writer. The many groundless, perplexed, and contradictory arguments, or rather conjectures, alleged by those who have taken most pains to prove both the above-mentioned pieces genuine, namely, by Chifflerus, Papebrok, and cardinal Noris, are, perhaps, a more convincing proof of their being forged, than any that can be alleged against them. There is so palpable a difference, in point of style, between this letter, and that which Syricius wrote to Himerius, and which is on all hands allowed to be genuine, that no one can possibly suppose both to have been penned by one and the same person. Besides, in the former letter Syricius absolutely commands, and in this only advises, exhorts, and entreats the priests and deacons to live continent. Of these two difficulties none of the writers I have just quoted have thought fit to take the least notice, though they could hardly escape their observation. The very first canon or article of this letter, for the sake of which both the letter itself, and the acts of the

I find no farther mention made of Syricius, in the ancient writers, till the year 390, when

council, were most probably forged, sufficiently betrays the forgery. For it is absolutely unintelligible, and therefore pointed, construed, altered, &c. in twenty different manners, by those who maintain it to be genuine. Some read it thus: "Ut sine conscientia sedis apostolicæ primatis nemo audeat ordinare;" "That no one should presume to ordain without the knowledge of the primate of the apostolic see." I do not find the bishops of Rome to have ever styled themselves, in their letters, primates of the apostolic see; nay, the humble title of primate of the apostolic see (humble with respect to the bishop of Rome, primate, prince, and monarch of the whole church,) so soured Labbé, that he fairly owned the truth, choosing rather to give up the letter, than to admit a title that seemed to detract from the supremacy. Besides, it is very certain, that, in the time of Syricius the bishops of Rome were not yet so lost to all modesty as to pretend, in open defiance of the canons, that no bishop should be ordained without their knowledge. Others read that article thus: "Ut extra conscientiam sedis apostolicæ, hoc est, primatis, &c." "That none should presume to ordain without the knowledge of the apostolic see, that is, of their primate." Now, it is probable, that the bishop of Rome would have given the title of apostolic see to all the metropolitan churches; a title which pope Leo the Great would not allow even to the bishop of Constantinople?<sup>(a)</sup> I might add, that the author of this letter writes, and I think very ridiculously, that the African bishops would have come to Rome to assist at the council, had they not been prevented by their infirmities, or old age; which is supposing them all to have been old or infirm; that the subscription of this letter is very singular, "Data Romæ in concilio episcoporum octoginta," which in all other synodal letters is placed at the beginning; that neither this letter, nor the council of Tela, by which it is supposed to have been quoted, are ever mentioned or taken notice of by any of the councils, that were afterwards held in Africa, to establish the celibacy of the clergy. Some will have this letter to have been written only for the bishops of the vicariate of Rome, of which Syricius was primate, and to have been sent by him to the bishops of Africa, and perhaps to those of the other provinces, with a design to try whether they might not be prompted to receive the canons it contained, as general rules, though made for the vicariate only. This had been attempting to establish at once, and to a manner by surprise, a universal jurisdiction. But I can hardly believe, that, in the days of Syricius, when the ambition of the bishops of Rome was yet in its infancy, they should have aspired to, or entertained any notion of such a jurisdiction. As to the council, I shall only observe here, that it is said in all the printed copies of the councils, all the ancient manuscripts, but one, to have been held at Tela, in the province of Byzacene, whereas Tela is allowed, even by those who defend this council as genuine, to have belonged to the proconsularis. They have therefore nothing else to recur to but the ignorance of the transcribers, the usual refuge in such cases, whom they all agree to have been mistaken, though all equally at a loss, and at variance among themselves, how to correct the supposed mistake. For, instead of Tela, some read Zela or Zella, others Tena, Tenepis, Teleptus, &c. In short, there is not a single town in the whole province of Byzacene, bearing the least resemblance in name with Tela, that has not been substituted in its room; nay, some have bestowed that honor on the smallest villages, as if it were probable, that, in a province, filled, as Byzacene was, with considerable cities, and episcopal sees, bishops should choose to assemble in a village. To read Proconsularis instead of Byzacene, as some have done, is contradicting, and consequently giving up, the acts of that council; for the thirty-three bishops named there as composing it, were all of the latter province, and Vincentius and Fortunatianus are said to have assisted as deputies from the former.<sup>(b)</sup> It would be needless to dwell any longer on this subject, and point out the many absurdities and contradictions that occur in the supposed acts of that council, since the very title must convince every impartial reader, that no such council was ever held. I cannot, however, help taking notice of a very extraordinary canon, quoted by Ferrandus, from the letter of Syricius, and approved, as is said there, by

(a) Leo. ep. 78.

(b) Concil. t. 1. p. 1577.



he condemned the doctrine of Jovinian, and cast him and his followers out of the church. Jovinian was by profession a monk, by birth a Latin, as Jerom observes, and the first who infected that language with heresy; all, or rather almost all, the heresies that, for the first four hundred years, had disturbed the peace of the church, having been broached by Greeks, Chaldæans, or Syrians.<sup>1</sup> He had formerly practised great austerities, going bare-footed, living upon bread and water, covered with a tattered black garment, and earning his livelihood by the sweat of his brow, his hands being callous with long and hard labor.<sup>2</sup> The doctrine he taught is, by Jerom, reduced to the four following heads. 1. That those, who, with a lively faith, have been regenerated by baptism, cannot afterwards be overcome by the devil. 2. That for all those, who shall preserve their baptism, an equal reward is reserved in heaven. 3. That there is no difference of merit between abstaining from some meats, and using them with thanksgiving. 4. and lastly, That virgins, widows, and married women, are in a state of equal merit; and, consequently, that all difference in merit can only arise from their different actions. That the two last were then counted heresies, shows that the church began, in this century, to be tainted with doctrines that border on popery, and no ways consist with the liberty of the gospel.<sup>3</sup> Besides these tenets, Jovinian taught, as Ambrose and Austin inform us, that the Virgin Mary preserved her virginity in conceiving our Savior, but lost it in bringing him forth, pretending to prove by arguments, "false, but ingenious enough," say they, that we should otherwise be obliged to own, with the Manichees, the body of Christ not to have been real, but aerial.<sup>4</sup> He, besides, charged the catholics with Manicheism, on account of their preferring the state of virginity to that of matrimony.<sup>5</sup> Both Jerom and Ambrose tell us, that, together with his doctrine, he changed his manners, renouncing his former austerities, and giving himself up to all manner of debauchery, to redeem, as it were, the time he had lost.<sup>6</sup> But perhaps this charge was not well founded, but rather supposed as a consequence of his undervaluing celibacy, and the merit ascribed to it, there being too many instances in ecclesiastical history of such inferences, drawn from opinions which were not approved by the fathers of the church, as could no way be justified. They often painted those, whom they styled heretics, in

the blackest colors, to prejudice the people more effectually against their doctrine. In this art Jerom excelled all the rest, and none ever disagreed with him, who did not at once forfeit those very virtues, which he himself had admired and extolled in them before. He abstained, however, from matrimony; but merely, say Austin and Jerom, to avoid the trouble and anxiety attending it, and not because he apprehended there could be in this life any merit in continency, or any reward allotted for it in the next.<sup>1</sup> This doctrine he broached in Rome, and soon found there a great number of followers, among the rest several of both sexes, who had embraced, and professed for many years, the state of virginity, being seduced and misled, says Austin, by the cavils of that impious wretch, asking them whether they pretended to be more holy than Abraham and Sarah, than many other men and women, who, though married, are commended in the Old Testament, for their eminent sanctity.<sup>2</sup> The first, who took offence at this doctrine, were two laymen, namely, Pammachius and Victorinus. All we know of the latter is, that he was illustrious for his birth, and, if we believe Ambrose, venerable for his piety.<sup>3</sup> As for Pammachius, he is well known in the history of the church, and often mentioned by Jerom with the greatest commendations. He was descended, says that writer, from the ancient family of the Camilli, and yet less distinguished by the nobility of his descent than his piety.<sup>4</sup> Having heard, by chance, some of the propositions advanced by Jovinian, he made it his business to inquire more narrowly into his doctrine, being assisted therein by Victorinus, who had taken the alarm upon hearing, in Rome, this "shocking doctrine," says Jerom,<sup>5</sup> that "a virgin was no better than a married woman." These two having, by a diligent inquiry, discovered at length the whole doctrine of Jovinian, as well as the author and promoters of it, they presented a request to Syricius, acquainting him therewith, and desiring, that the doctrine of Jovinian might be condemned by the episcopal authority, and the sentence of the Holy Ghost, as contrary to the law of God.<sup>6</sup> These are Ambrose's words, as the text now is; but it is generally thought to have been altered and corrupted. Be that as it will, Syricius did not take upon him to act on this occasion by his private authority; but, assembling the priests, deacons, and other ecclesiastics of Rome, he read to them the request of Pammachius and Victorinus, and, having, together with them, maturely examined the doctrine of Jovinian, he declared it, with the unanimous consent of the whole assembly, contrary to scripture; and at the same time cut off, for ever, from the communion of the church, not only Jovinian, who

the council of Tela; namely, "That no bishop should be ordained by a single bishop, the church of Rome excepted." This exception is not to be found in the letter ascribed to Syricius, from which they make Ferrandus quote it; and, besides, the bishops of Rome were never ordained by a single bishop, nor did they ever take upon them to ordain bishops alone.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. t. 2. p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib. l. 1. c. 25. Aug. hæres. 82. Amb. ep. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. ib. c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. op. imp. l. 4. c. 121. & hæres. 82. Amb. ep. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 2. & ad Bon. l. 2. c. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. ib. c. 25. Amb. ep. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Amb. ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. hæres. 82. Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Amb. ep. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. ep. 26.

<sup>5</sup> Id. ep. 50.

<sup>6</sup> Amb. ep. 6.



Law enacted against Jovinian and his followers. New disturbances in the church of Antioch.

had first broached such a doctrine, but those among his followers, who were found to have been the most sanguine in promoting it; namely, Auxentius, Genialis, Germinator, Felix, Frontinus, Martianus, Januarius, and Ingenius.<sup>1</sup> Jovinian, instead of submitting to the judgment of Syricius, and his clergy, immediately left Rome, and repaired with all speed to Milan, not despairing of being able to engage Ambrose in his favor, and likewise the emperor Theodosius, who was then in that city, before Syricius could prejudice them against him. Of this Syricius was aware, and therefore without loss of time, despatched three of his presbyters to Milan, Crescentius, Leopardus, and Alexander, with a letter to that church, which has been transmitted to us among Ambrose's works,<sup>2</sup> acquainting them with what had passed at Rome. In virtue of this letter he was rejected by Ambrose; and, at the request of the three Roman presbyters, driven out of the town by the emperor.(\*).

The letter of Syricius was answered by Ambrose, and signed by him, and several other bishops, who were still at Milan, where they had met to condemn Ithacius, and his adherents, for having been accessory to the death of Priscillian. In their answer they commend the pastoral vigilance of Syricius, and, having briefly declared their opinion against the other tenets of Jovinian, dwell on what he had advanced against the virginity of the Virgin Mary. But they seem to have mistaken his meaning, in charging him with Manicheism, and supposing him to have held, that our Savior did not assume a real body: for he held no such doctrine, but only charged the catholics with it, as Austin tells us in express terms.<sup>3</sup> It is surprising, that such a question should have thus employed the thoughts and attention of so many venerable prelates, and created such feuds and animosities in the church. Both parties agreed, that the virgin Mary had brought forth her son without the co-operation or intercourse of man; and in that sense alone she is styled a virgin.

From Milan Jovinian returned to the neighborhood of Rome, where his followers continued to assemble, under his direction, till the year 398, when the emperor Honorius, giving ear to the complaints of the neighboring bishops, enacted a law, commanding him and his accomplices to be beaten with whips armed with lead, and transported into different islands.<sup>4</sup> Jovinian himself was confined to the isle of Boas, on the coast of Dalmatia,<sup>5</sup> where

he gave up the ghost, about the year 406, in the midst of the mirth and jollity of a banquet, says Jerom, adding that he was revived in Vigilantius, as Euphorbus was formerly in Pythagoras.<sup>1</sup> Some of Jerom's friends in Rome sent him the book, which Jovinian had composed to explain and defend his doctrine, begging him to confute it. He readily complied with their request, and ended his work in the year 392. It consisted of two books, but met with a very indifferent reception at Rome. For though he declared from the beginning, that it was not his intention to condemn marriage, and that he had an utter abhorrence to the errors of Marcion, of Tatian, and the Manichees, holding marriage to be sinful; yet the disparaging terms he made use of in speaking of marriage, gave great offence, even to those who professed continency.(\*).

Notwithstanding the severity of the law I have mentioned above, some still continued to hold, and privately to propagate, the doctrine of Jovinian, which induced Austin to compose his treatise on the advantages of marriage and virginity; a performance far more judicious than that of Jerom, who has taken great pains to disparage and cry down marriage, the better to extol virginity, as if he could not commend the one without condemning the other. Austin, on the contrary, begins his work with great encomiums on matrimony, to which, however commendable, in the end he prefers virginity. But after all, the reasons alleged by the one as well as the other, are, if duly weighed, but empty and inconclusive speculations.

The following year, 391, a great council was convened at Capua, chiefly with a view to restore peace to the church of Antioch, and put an end to the schism, which had long prevailed there, and had occasioned almost an entire separation between the east and the west, as I have related elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Paulinus, who was acknowledged for lawful bishop of that city by part of the catholics there, by the bishops of Egypt, Arabia, Cyprus, by the bishop of Rome, and all the western bishops, died about the year 388.<sup>3</sup> But the unhappy division, which had reigned during his life, continued to reign even after his death. For Paulinus by a most unaccountable conduct, and a most notorious and open violation of the canons, took upon him not only to appoint himself a successor before he died, but to or-

<sup>1</sup> Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

(\*) This induced Pammachius to purchase all the copies of it he could get, and send them back to the author, acquainting him in a friendly manner with what had chiefly given offence. (a) This Jerom took as a token of the most sincere friendship; and therefore, not satisfied with acknowledging the obligations he had laid on him, and commending his conduct as worthy of his great prudence, and answerable to the affection which it was owing to, he immediately set about the apology which Pammachius had advised him to write, and inscribed it to him. (b)

(a) Ex Ruff. p. 231. & ep. 52. (b) Hier. ep. 51, 52.

<sup>2</sup> Vide p. 220.

<sup>3</sup> Soz. l. 5. c. 15. & l. 7. c. 15. Hier. vir. ill. c. 125.

<sup>1</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ep. 7.

(\*) Baronius pretends it was on this occasion that Theodosius enacted the law, dated from Verona the 3d of September of the present year, 390, commanding all, who professed a monastic life, to quit the cities, and retire, pursuant to their profession, into the deserts. (a) But that it was made on a very different occasion, it will fall in my way to show hereafter.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 390. n. 47, 48.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. in Jul. 1. l. c. 2. <sup>4</sup> Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. in vigil. c. 1.



The council of Capua. The difference between the two competitors to the see of Antioch referred, by the council, to the bishops of Egypt.

dain him alone. The person whom he thus both named and ordained, was one Evagrius, a presbyter, with whom he had always lived in close friendship;<sup>1</sup> and who on that account was, notwithstanding his illegal election and ordination, acknowledged by Paulinus' party for bishop of Antioch. Theodoret writes, that the bishop of Rome, with the other western bishops, and those of Egypt, embraced his communion.<sup>2</sup> But Ambrose assures us, that the bishops of Egypt stood neuter, suspending all communication both with Evagrius, and his competitor Flavianus; and speaks in such manner of both, as gives us room to suppose that he himself communicated with neither. "Both rely more on the invalidity of their competitor's ordination," says he, "than on the validity of their own. It is therefore with reason that Flavianus declines a fair trial, and not without reason that Evagrius does not demand one."<sup>3</sup> The example of Ambrose was, in all likelihood, followed by the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops; or, Ambrose, perhaps, conformed to theirs.(\*).

All the bishops of Illyricum, upon the death of Paulinus, admitted Flavianus, and not Evagrius, to their communion, if we may depend upon Theodoret.<sup>4</sup> As this new election occasioned unheard-of disturbances in the church of Antioch, as the division still continued between the east and the west, the western bishops had frequent recourse to the emperor Theodosius, during the three years he passed in the west, pressing him to oblige, by his imperial authority, both Flavianus and Evagrius to submit their cause to the judgment of a council, that should be held in Italy. Theodosius consented at last to their request, named Capua for the place where the council should meet, and took upon him to oblige Flavianus to repair thither at the time appointed. Soon after, that is, about the 14th of July, 391, he left Italy, where he had continued ever since the year 388, settling young Valentinian on the throne, and set out for Constantinople, into which city he made his entry on the 10th of November. Before his departure from Italy he had written to Flavianus, commanding him to repair to Constantinople, and wait his arrival there. Flavianus readily complied with the emperor's orders, and appeared at court the day after his arrival. But when the prince acquainted him with the promise he had made to the western bishops, and desired

him to prepare for the journey, which he did in a very obliging manner, Flavianus represented to him the inconveniences attending so long a journey at that season of the year, and begged he would give him leave to put it off to the spring, when he would not fail to obey his orders. The emperor, seeing him stricken in years, thought the excuse just and reasonable; and therefore, out of compassion and good nature, allowed him for the present to return to his see.<sup>1</sup> Thus did Flavianus, by the indulgence of the emperor, avoid the judgment of the western bishops, who wisely forbore meddling with so nice a subject in his absence, though his competitor was present.

The council of Capua met in the latter end of the year 391, and was, it seems, a very numerous assembly, since it is styled, in the canons of the church of Africa, "a full council."<sup>2</sup> But whether it was composed of all the western bishops, or only of the bishops of Italy, is uncertain, and cannot be determined from the words of Ambrose, "We all met,"<sup>3</sup> which may be equally understood of both. As the acts of this council have not reached our times, we do not even know who presided at it, some conferring that honor on Ambrose,<sup>4</sup> some on Syricius,<sup>5</sup> and some on both.<sup>6</sup> That Syricius presided, or even assisted, in person, is not at all probable; for in the times I am now writing of, the bishops of Rome had begun to affect grandeur; and, under pretence that their presence was necessary in the great metropolis of the empire, to assist or preside in councils held elsewhere by their deputies or legates, as they are now styled. That Syricius assisted, by his deputies, at the council of Capua, I do not doubt, since the council was composed, at least, of all the bishops of Italy, and Syricius owned himself bound by their decrees.<sup>7</sup> But that Ambrose presided, seems undeniable, since by him, and him alone, the whole was conducted and managed.(\*).

The council avoided deciding, and even taking into consideration, the affair of Flavianus and Evagrius, in the absence of the former, though they had chiefly met for that purpose. However, to re-establish the tranquillity of the church, they agreed to renew their correspondence with, and grant their communion to, all the Catholic bishops of the east. As for the difference between the two competitors for the see of Antioch, they committed the discussing and deciding it to Theophylus, bishop of Alexandria, and the

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. l. 5. c. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. ib.

<sup>3</sup> Amb. ep. 9.

(\*) A modern writer will have it by all means, that Syricius communicated with Evagrius (a), because he had always opposed Flavianus, as his predecessors had done. But surely from his espousing the cause of Paulinus, who was legally chosen, against Flavianus, whose election was contested, we cannot well conclude, that, in opposition to him, he likewise took the part of one whose election was indisputably illegal. It is far more probable, that he communicated with neither.

(a) M. Launoy, ep. 7. p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Theod. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Id. ib. & Amb. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1072.

<sup>3</sup> Amb. ep. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Laun. ep. 7. p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 391.

<sup>6</sup> Blond. Prim. p. 237.

<sup>7</sup> Amb. ep. 9.

(\*) Baronius, without the least foundation in history, supposes Ambrose to have acted as the pope's legate. But it is the custom of that writer to vest every eminent and distinguished prelate with the legatine dignity on such occasions, and then pass upon his readers the deference and regard shown to their merit for a tribute paid to the bishops of Rome.



Flavianus refuses to comply with the decree of the council. Ambrose's moderation and impartiality. Syricius writes to the emperor. Flavianus ready to resign his dignity, rather than to submit to the judgment of the Egyptian or western bishops. Flavianus did not acknowledge in Syricius the power claimed by his successors.

other bishops of Egypt, as the most proper judges, since they communicated with neither, and therefore, could not be suspected to favor the one more than the other.<sup>1</sup> The bishop of Alexandria immediately acquainted Flavianus with the resolution of the council, summoning him, at the same time, to appear, in compliance therewith, before the bishops of Egypt, who were soon to assemble, in order to put the decree of that venerable assembly in execution. But Flavianus, instead of obeying the summons, and paying the regard that was thought due to the decree of so numerous a council, refused to stir from Antioch, pleading a rescript, which he had extorted from Theodosius, commanding the western bishops to repair into the east, and there examine the affair in a new council. This Theophylus did not expect, and therefore being at a loss how to conduct himself on such an emergency, he gave Ambrose immediate notice of the summons he had sent, and the answer he had received. Ambrose had nothing so much at heart as to restore peace and tranquillity to the church of Antioch; and from the regard which the council had shown to Flavianus, as well as the impartiality with which they had acted with respect to both, he had promised himself success in so pious an undertaking. It was therefore with the utmost concern that he saw his endeavors thus unexpectedly defeated, and all hopes of accomplishing what he had undertaken, vanish at once. He had but too much reason to resent such an affronting conduct, which did not so much affect the council in general, as him in particular, since it was at his motion, that the council took the above-mentioned resolution. That, however, did not tempt him to depart from the neutrality he had embraced, and declare for Evagrius: he still maintained the same impartiality, and refused to communicate with either. In his answer to Theophylus, he desires him, without betraying the least emotion of anger or resentment, to summon Flavianus once more, directing him, at the same time, to communicate with all the catholic bishops of the east, pursuant to the decree of the council, whether he complied with this second summons or not; and to acquaint the bishop of Rome with what he had done, that, the whole being approved by that church, as he did not question but it would, the whole church might be happily of one mind, and reap the fruit of his labor.<sup>2</sup>

Syricius, and in all likelihood Ambrose too, wrote to Theodosius, pressing him to send Flavianus to Rome, (\*) if he did not approve of his being judged by the bishop of Alexandria. Syricius, in his letter, tells the emperor, that he well knew how to deal with tyrants, who revolted from him, and how to chastise them;

but suffered those to go unpunished, who despised the laws of Christ.<sup>1</sup>(\*)

Theodosius, in compliance with the request of Syricius, made in the name of all the western bishops, sent anew for Flavianus, and told him, that he must, by all means, either repair to Rome, or submit his cause to the judgment of the bishops of Egypt. But he was determined, says Theodoret, to relinquish his dignity rather than to suffer the western bishops, or those of Egypt, to examine and decide whether he had a right to it or not; and, by that means to hold it to them. He therefore answered the emperor with great calmness and respect, in the following terms: "Sir, if my faith is not thought orthodox, or my conduct not worthy of a catholic bishop, I am willing to be judged by those who accuse me, and ready to submit to the sentence they shall pronounce. But, if all this noise is made merely for the sake of my dignity, from this moment I resign every preferment I enjoy in the church, to those whom nothing but preferment can silence. You may therefore dispose of the see of Antioch, now vacant, to whom you please." Theodosius, pleased with this answer, and thinking Flavianus, the more ready he was to give up his dignity, the more worthy to hold it, ordered him to return to Antioch, and resume the government of his church; nor did he ever afterwards give the least attention to the pressing and repeated instances of Syricius, and his colleagues in the west.<sup>2</sup>

From the whole conduct of Flavianus it is manifest, that he did not acknowledge any extraordinary power in Syricius, much less that power, which has been claimed by his successors, of disposing, by divine right, of all bishoprics, of placing and displacing bishops, at pleasure throughout the Christian world. This power, though evidently usurped, and utterly unknown even in the end of the fourth century, bishops are now obliged to own in their very titles, styling themselves bishops of such a place, by the grace of God, and of the apostolic see. Flavianus was content with the grace of God; and, as for the grace of the apostolic see, he gave himself no trouble about it. And yet Flavianus is honored by the church of Rome as a saint; and his festival kept on the 26th of September. And truly, if we may depend upon the testimony of the most authentic and unexceptionable writers of those times, we shall hardly find one in the Roman calendar more worthy of that honor. The famous John Chrysostom, who was one of his presbyters before his pro-

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

(\*) Theodoret tells us, that Damasus, Syricius, and Anastasius the successor of Syricius, wrote to the emperor Theodosius about the dispute between Flavianus and Evagrius. A gross mistake! since Damasus was dead long before the election of Evagrius, and Theodosius before that of Anastasius.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

(\*) That is, into the west; for thus Theodoret constantly expresses the west.



The communion between the east and the west renewed. Bonosus accused before the council. His errors. The judging of his cause committed by the council to the neighboring bishops, who condemn him.

motion to the see of Constantinople, has filled his homilies with the praises of "the great Flavianus," as he styles him. His distinguished merit, eminent virtues, and extraordinary piety, seem to have been Chrysostom's favorite topic; and these encomiums he bestowed upon him, while he was still alive. After his death he was distinguished by the council of Chalcedon, with the title of "the blessed Flavianus;"<sup>1</sup> and by that of the east, held under John of Antioch, ranked among the brightest luminaries, the most illustrious prelates, and the greatest saints of the church.<sup>2</sup> Theodoret never names him without adding to his name some epithet, denoting his extraordinary merit, such as "the great, the holy, the admirable" Flavianus. As therefore no room is left to doubt of his extraordinary piety and merit, we may well conclude, from his absolutely refusing to submit his cause to the judgment of Syricius, and the other bishops of the west, that he did not acknowledge either in him or them a power to judge him. This refusal did not, in the eyes of Chrysostom, and other great men, detract in the least from his merit, nor lessen the high opinion they entertained of his sanctity. A plain indication that they did not think his conduct reprehensible, and consequently did not acknowledge, more than he, that power which is now one main article of the Roman catholic creed.

As Flavianus declined the judgment of the western as well as the Egyptian bishops, and the emperor gave no farther ear to their remonstrances and complaints, the resolution taken by the council of Capua was put in execution; which was, to renew the communion and good understanding between the east and the west, and abandon the church of Antioch to its schism, which, after so many promising remedies applied in vain, began now to be deemed an incurable evil.<sup>3</sup>

The council of Capua, after the above-mentioned resolution concerning the difference between Flavianus and Evagrius, heard a charge brought by some bishops against Bonosus, bishop of Naissus in Dacia, according to some, or, as others will have it, of Sardica, the metropolis of that province. He was accused of a crime against the canons of the church, and the law of God,<sup>4</sup> and likewise of heresy. The crime is not specified; but as for the heresy, I gather from Austin that he held the Son to be inferior to the Father;<sup>5</sup> and from Ambrose, that he taught, the Virgin Mary had had other children after the birth of Christ.<sup>6</sup> He had, it seems, been condemned by Damasus, who died in 384,<sup>7</sup> but still held his see, and was not driven from it, even by the council of Capua. For the fathers of that assembly committed the hearing and judging of his cause to the bishops in his neighbor-

hood, chiefly to those of Macedon, under their metropolitan Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica.<sup>1</sup> The neighboring bishops assembled, pursuant to the order of the council; and Bonosus, as well as his accusers, appearing before them, they found the charge so well supported, that they immediately forbade him to enter his church; which was suspending him from all episcopal functions. Bonosus complained loudly of this sentence, and even advised with the bishop of Milan, whether he might not, in defiance of a judgment so rash and immature, still exercise the functions of his office, and, in case of opposition, repel force with force. Ambrose exhorted him, in the strongest terms, to acquiesce to the sentence, to conduct himself with the prudence, temper, and moderation, that became a bishop; and, above all, not to undertake any thing that might be interpreted as a contempt of the authority of his judges, since he could not condemn their authority, without condemning at the same time that of the council, which had appointed them.<sup>2</sup> In the mean time the bishops of Macedon, having more leisurely examined the cause of Bonosus, wrote to Syricius, referring the decision to him, and declaring their abhorrence of the detestable error, that the Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ. If this was an error, which may well be doubted, it was one that did no way affect the Christian faith, and therefore did not deserve such a severe condemnation: but as it thwarted the favorable opinions then entertained in the church concerning virginity, it is no wonder that it should meet with so rough a treatment. (\*)

<sup>1</sup> Amb. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.

(\*) That the Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ, was not a new opinion. It was taught by Helvidius in 383, and long before him by Tertullian, as Jerom himself is forced to own in the treatise which he wrote against Helvidius: nay, in the time of Epiphanius, who flourished from the year 366 to 403, that opinion universally prevailed in Arabia, as appears from the letter which he wrote in confutation of it, and addressed to all the Christians dwelling in Arabia, from the presbyters down to the catechumens. In that letter he styles those who denied the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary, Antidicomarianites; and ranks them, though their opinion had not yet been condemned by the church, sometimes among the heretics, and sometimes among the schismatics. But in the same letter he censures, with no less severity, those who adored her, styling the worship that was paid her an idolatrous heresy; which was taxing those who paid it both with heresy and idolatry; and from neither will the unmeaning terms of *latria*, *dulia*, *hyperdulia*, &c. invented and used by the schoolmen to express different degrees of worship, excuse the present practice of the church of Rome. Epiphanius was unacquainted with such terms, as well as with the different degrees of worship answering them; and therefore called the meeting of certain women, on a stated day, to offer a cake to the Virgin Mary, and eat it together in her honor, (whence they had the name of Collyridians,) "a folly repugnant to religion, an illusion of the devil, a robbing God of the honor that was due to him, an idolatrous heresy." (a) These women came from the northern provinces of Scythia into Thrace, probably about the year 372, when Athanaric, king of the Goths, drove all the Christians out of his dominions. From Thrace they wandered into Arabia; and there, in opposition to the Antidicomarianites (a) Epiph. hæc. 78, 79.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 830. <sup>2</sup> Facund. Hermian. l. 8. c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Ruff. l. 11. c. 22. <sup>4</sup> Mercat. t. 2. p. 128.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. ep. 150.

<sup>6</sup> Amb. ep. 5. & Instit. Virg. p. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Merc. ib.



Bonosus exercises the episcopal functions after his condemnation. He ordains some by force. An end to the schism of Antioch.

Syricius, in his answer to the bishops of Macedon, approves their sentiments; and employs almost his whole letter to show, that the Virgin Mary was always a virgin: but as for the cause of Bonosus, he tells them, that "it was not lawful for him to judge it, since that province had been committed to them by the council of Capua."<sup>1</sup> And was not this disclaiming, in the most plain and explicit terms he possibly could, that power which his successors challenge, and have almost overturned the Christian religion to maintain. (\*)

As Syricius declined the judging of Bonosus, his cause was in the end decided, and he condemned by Anysius and the other bishops, to whom that judgment had been committed by the council of Capua. It was at the same

anites, introduced the above-mentioned idolatrous practice. This is the first instance of any worship paid to the Virgin Mary; and to those women the extravagant worship that is still paid her by the church of Rome owes its rise. Some of these women took upon them to act, at their meetings as priestesses. This Epiphanius styles an abominable abuse, women being so utterly incapable, says he, of performing any ecclesiastical functions, that our Savior did not grant even to his mother the power of baptizing. (a)

(\*) Such a letter, we may be sure, has not been tamely received by the partisans of Rome. Some of them have rejected it as forged and surreptitious, for no other reason, but because Syricius is there made to disclaim a power which he undoubtedly had. But this is evidently begging the question. (b) Others finding it conveyed to us amongst Ambrose's letters, have ascribed it to him, by prefixing his name to it. But Ambrose is unluckily named, and spoken of, in the body of the letter: whence Baronius himself allows it not to be his. (c) The style afforded great matter of dispute, some thinking it like, and others unlike, to the style of Syricius: but more than the style, the title; "To Theophilus and Anysius." The former was bishop of Alexandria: and how came he to be any-ways concerned in the cause of Bonosus? If that name was common to him with some bishops of Macedon, how came that bishop to be named before Anysius his metropolitane? (d) In the height of these disputes, Holstenius published the above-mentioned letter at Rome, under the name of Syricius, from a very ancient and authentic manuscript, with the following title, "To Anysius and the other bishops of Illyricum." (e) This turned the controversy into another channel; for the dispute was no more concerning the authenticity, but the sense, of the letter, which the sticklers of the see of Rome began to think very different from the sense that the words of Syricius had conveyed to them before; nay, those who had rejected the letter as spurious, for no other reason but because Syricius was there made to disown a power which he undoubtedly had, were not ashamed now to maintain, that he disowned no such power. Some of them have a particular faculty or talent at making authors say what they never thought or dreamt of; nay, at making them affirm what they flatly deny, and deny what they positively affirm. But they have not been so successful on this as on several other occasions. The words of Syricius are too plain and precise to admit of any plausible, or even probable, misinterpretation. To avoid therefore the tiresome and unnecessary task of confuting the forced interpretations they have put on the words of Syricius, I refer the reader to his letter, which is the fifth amongst Ambrose's letters; and leave him to judge, whether it was possible for him to disclaim, in terms less liable to misinterpretations, the power of judging a cause committed by a council to the judgment of others, which was disclaiming, in other words, that universal jurisdiction, which his successors have usurped, and pretended to exercise by Divine right.

(a) Idem Ibid.

(b) David, p. 562, 563. (c) Bar. ad ann. 389. n. 76.

(d) Vid. Blond. primau. (e) Holst. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 236.

<sup>1</sup> Amb. ibid.

time decreed, that those who had been ordained by him after the first sentence, that is, after his suspension, should retain the degrees to which he had raised them. This indulgence was shown, as is declared in the decree, contrary to the common rule, on account of the present necessity; that is, lest they should adhere to Bonosus, and form a schism.<sup>1</sup> Bonosus, though thus condemned, continued to exercise the episcopal functions, and, holding separate assemblies, to ordain, without examination or distinction, all who presented themselves to him: nay, he is even charged with dragging some by open force to his conventicle, and ordaining them there against their will:<sup>2</sup> a kind of rape never heard of before. What advantage he could propose to himself or others in so doing, we are not told, and it is not easy to guess. The bishops of Macedon allowed even those, who were thus ordained, to keep their respective degrees in the catholic church, upon their only receiving the benediction of a lawful bishop. Hence those, who found themselves excluded by the church from holy orders, on account of their scandalous lives, applied to Bonosus, pretending to espouse his party, but left him as soon as they had obtained the degree they wanted.<sup>3</sup> Bonosus died about the year 410, but his doctrine did not die with him, being maintained by some two hundred years after his death. (\*)

Syricius had, in the last year of his life, the satisfaction of seeing an end put at length to the schism of Antioch, which I have had so frequent occasion to speak of; and the east and west, after so long a misunderstanding, or rather separation, happily reunited. This great work was accomplished in the following manner: Evagrius, the successor to Paulinus, dying not long after his promotion, Flavianus employed all the credit and interest he had at court, and with the clergy of Antioch, to prevent the election of a new bishop in the room of the deceased: and so far his endeavors proved successful. But he could by no means gain the Eustathians, who continued to assemble apart, or prevail either upon the bishops of Egypt, or Syricius, and

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1274.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 1275.

<sup>3</sup> Ib.

(\*) His followers were known by the name of Bonosians or Bonosians; and mention is made of them by Pope Gregory, towards the latter end of the sixth century. (a) That pope writes, as does likewise Gennadius, (b) that the church rejected their baptism, because they did not baptize in the name of the three Divine persons. But the council of Arles, held in 452, by the seventeenth canon, commands the Bonosians to be received into the church by the holy unction, the imposition of hands, and a confession of faith, it being certain, that they baptize in the name of the trinity. (c) It is to be observed, that several writers have confounded the Bonosians with the Photinians, who did not baptize in the name of the three persons; and by them both Gregory and Gennadius were misled. (d)

(a) Greg. l. 9. ep. 61.

(b) Id. ib. Genn. dog. c. 52.

(c) Avit. frag. p. 188.

(d) Vide Concil. t. 2. p. 1270. & t. 3. p. 663. & t. 4. p. 1013.



Chrysostom studies to reconcile the eastern and western bishops. Flavianus and Theophilus reconciled. Chrysostom attempts a reconciliation between Flavianus and Syricius. His prudent conduct. Syricius and Flavianus reconciled.

the other western bishops, to admit him to their communion, though he had no competitor, whose cause they could espouse against him. Thus, through the inflexible obstinacy of the Egyptian and western bishops, was discord kept alive, and a kind of schism fomented among the prelates and members of the catholic church, says Sozomen.<sup>1</sup> In this situation affairs continued from the year 392, in which Evagrius died, to the year 398, when the famous John Chrysostom, presbyter of the church of Antioch, was, in regard of his extraordinary merit, preferred to the see of Constantinople. No sooner was he placed in that high station, than his generous disposition, above all little piques and jealousies, his zeal for the welfare of the church in general, and the tender regard he had for that of Antioch in particular, prompted him to employ all the credit and authority, which his new dignity gave him, in bringing about an entire reconciliation between the east and the west, and restoring the church of Antioch to the communion of those churches, from which it had been so long separated.<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom had been consecrated by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, whom the council of Capua had appointed to decide, with the other bishops of Egypt, the difference between Flavianus and Evagrius, as I have related above, to him therefore, before he left Constantinople to return to Egypt, the new bishop of that city, impatient to see so great a work brought to a happy issue, imparted his intention of attempting a reconciliation between Flavianus and Syricius, bishop of Rome, earnestly entreating him to second and promote with his endeavors an undertaking truly worthy of the two bishops of the east.

There had subsisted a misunderstanding between Theophilus and Flavianus ever since the year 391, when the council of Capua was held. Flavianus had refused to submit his cause to the judgment of Theophilus pursuant to the resolution of that council; which he had highly resented; and, in the height of his resentment, as he was a man of a fiery and choleric temper, he had written to Flavianus in a very haughty and imperious style. To these letters Nestorius, no doubt, alludes, where he tells us, that Egypt could not, by her menacing letters, though written in the style, and with all the haughtiness, of an imperious tyrant, move or terrify the blessed Flavianus.<sup>3</sup> It was necessary, in the first place, to remove the misunderstanding which had so long subsisted between these two prelates; and in this Chrysostom met with no difficulty or obstruction, Theophilus readily agreeing to the terms he proposed in the name of Flavianus, and Flavianus ratifying them, upon the first notice, without the least exception or

limitation. What these terms were, we are no where told; but it is certain, that, all disputes being thereby composed, the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch were entirely reconciled, and the communion between them renewed, to the great satisfaction of both.<sup>1</sup> The next thing to be attempted, and, as was apprehended, the most difficult to be accomplished, was the reconciling of Syricius with the bishop of Antioch, who had now held that see seventeen years, but had not been able, notwithstanding the great character he bore, to obtain the communion of Syricius, or any of his predecessors, on account of their strong prejudice against him, as well as his predecessor Meletius, and their obstinate attachment to the contrary party, in opposition to the far greater part of the eastern bishops. But the zeal of Chrysostom was proof against all difficulties. Not despairing therefore of success, he took the most effectual means a consummate prudence could dictate, to obtain it, advising the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria to acquaint the bishop of Rome, by a solemn embassy, with their reconciliation, and at the same time to beg, in the name of Flavianus, the communion of that see. This he knew would flatter the vanity of Syricius, and be of more weight than any remonstrances they could make. They readily fell in with the proposal, and deputies were immediately chosen to put it in execution. These were Acacius, bishop of Berea, Demetrius of Pessinus, and several other bishops, with Isodorus, presbyter and hospitaler of the church of Alexandria, and a great number of presbyters and deacons of the church of Antioch. Acacius, who was at the head of this deputation, was charged by Chrysostom to present to Syricius the decree of his election to the see of Constantinople.<sup>2</sup> That so great an honor might not be conferred in vain on the see of Rome, it was thought advisable to acquaint Syricius with their design, before they set out, and to be well assured of a kind reception on their arrival in the west. They gave him accordingly early notice of their intention, and he, taken with the bait, readily promised to settle every thing to their satisfaction;<sup>3</sup> which he did accordingly, receiving them, on their arrival at Rome, with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, and admitting Flavianus to his communion. From Rome the deputies repaired into Egypt, where all the bishops, following the example of Theophilus and Syricius, acknowledged Flavianus for lawful bishop of Antioch, and, assembling in council, with great solemnity, embraced his communion. From Egypt the deputies set out for Antioch, and there, by delivering to Flavianus letters of communion from the western and Egyptian bishops, completed the

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 8. c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 23. Soz. l. 8. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Marc. t. 2. p. 86.

<sup>1</sup> Socr. l. 5. c. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 8. c. 3. Socr. l. 6. c. 9. Pallad. dial. c. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 23.



The misunderstanding between the east and the west entirely removed. Flavianus endeavors in vain to gain over the Eustathians. Flavianus honored by the church of Rome as a saint, though ill used in his life-time by the popes.

great work, and with it their deputation.<sup>1</sup> Thus was an end put, at last, to the schism of Antioch; and, after so many years of strife and contention, a perfect harmony and good understanding were settled anew between the east and the west. (\*)

<sup>1</sup> Soz. l. 5. c. 15. Theod. ib. Pallad. dial. p. 10.

(\*) If Syricius is to blame (and who, but Baronius, can excuse him?) for not acknowledging Flavianus, at least after the death of Paulinus, the election of his successor Evagrius being unquestionably uncanonical and illegal; how much more is he to blame for not acknowledging him even after the death of Evagrius, when he had no pretence whatsoever for denying him his communion, and by granting it he might have put an end to the schism? Baronius, to conceal the truth, and mislead his readers, takes a great deal of pains, in his account of this schism, to place in a false light all the transactions relating to it. But, in spite of all the art he has been able to use, to varnish over the conduct of Syricius, and impose on the public, it must appear undeniable to every impartial, I may say, to every rational, man, that the schism, and the many evils attending it, which are pathetically described by Chrysostom, who was then at Antioch, (a) were entirely owing to the pride and obstinacy of the bishop of Rome, at least during the last six years, that is, from the year 382, when Evagrius died, to 388, when he yielded, at last, upon his being courted to it by a solemn embassy. He had nothing then to object against the election, and much less against the conduct of Flavianus; and, if he had nothing then, he could have nothing before; so that it was merely from a haughty and obstinate spirit that he refused to communicate with him, and, by such a refusal, kept up and fomented a division so pernicious to the church. Baronius represents him as laboring with indefatigable pains to restore the tranquillity of the church, and leaving nothing unattempted that could any ways contribute to the promoting of so pious an undertaking, an undertaking which he had so much at heart. But that he had nothing at heart besides the glory of his see, is but too manifest from his conduct; for the minute that was saved, as it was by the above-mentioned deputation, all the difficulties vanished at once, which till then had obstructed the work. As for the conduct of Flavianus, in refusing to submit his cause to the judgment of the council of Capua, or of the Egyptian bishops, appointed to judge it by that council, it must appear, if impartially considered, more worthy of commendation than blame, though condemned, in very unbecoming terms by the sticklers for the see of Rome. He had been chosen in the oecumenical council of Constantinople, in the year 381, by the unanimous voice of all the bishops of the diocese of the east, or the patriarchate of Antioch, and soon after ordained in their presence, at Antioch, with the approbation of Nestorius, then bishop of Constantinople, and the loud acclamations of the far greater part of the people of Antioch, promising themselves, in him, a second Meletius, in whose room he was chosen. (b) Being thus chosen and ordained, he was acknowledged by all the bishops of the east except those of Egypt, of the island of Cyprus, and Arabia. Could he therefore, without shamefully betraying the undoubted right, which the bishops of each diocese had of choosing their metropolitan, suffer his election to be questioned and canvassed by the western bishops, who had no concern in it; and, besides had openly espoused the cause of his competitor Paulinus, and supported him, so long as he lived, with the most open and avowed partiality? Could he, without foregoing, in a manner still more shameful, both his own right, and that of his electors, out of compliance to the bishops assembled at Capua, put himself upon the level with Evagrius, whose election and ordination were undoubtedly illegal? Besides, Flavianus was sensible, that the eastern bishops would have paid no manner of regard to the sentence of the council; that, had the council adjudged the see of Antioch to Evagrius, such a judgment, instead of closing, would have widened the breach between the east and the west; and consequently, that his complying with their summons, far from answering the end they proposed to themselves,

(a) Chrys. in Eph. hom. 11.

(b) Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104.

Flavianus, being thus at last, in the seventeenth year of his episcopacy, acknowledged by, and united in communion with, all the bishops of the catholic church, spared no pains to gain over the Eustathians, that, by reuniting them to the rest of his flock, he might have the merit and glory of establishing an entire and lasting tranquillity in the church committed to his care. But his zeal was not therein attended with the wished-for success. The glory of completing so great and desirable a work was, by Providence, reserved for Alexander, one of his successors, who had the satisfaction of seeing all party-names laid aside, and the whole people of Antioch united in one flock, under one and the same shepherd. This union was made with great solemnity, in the year 415; eleven years after the death of Flavianus, and eighty-five after the beginning of the schism. Thus Theodoret, in his ecclesiastical history.<sup>1</sup> But Theodorus the lector assures us, that there still remained some seeds of that unhappy division till the year 482, when the body of Eustathius being brought back to Antioch, the few Eustathians who still continued to assemble apart, joined the rest of the catholics, and the name of Eustathius was never more heard of.<sup>2</sup> Flavianus died in the year 404, the ninety-fifth of his age, and twenty-third of his episcopacy, and is now honored as a saint; a distinction which none of his competitors have deserved, though as much caressed and favored by the two bishops of Rome, Damasus and Syricius, as he was opposed and ill used. How fallible have the bishops of that see showed themselves, from the earliest times, in their judgment of things! How rash in taking parties, and fomenting discords! How obstinate and inflexible in maintaining the cause, which they had once undertaken, let it be ever so bad! The only thing that can be alleged against the character of Flavianus, is his having accepted the bishopric of Antioch, contrary to the oath he had taken, on occasion of the agreement between Meletius and Paulinus, as I have related above.<sup>3</sup> That he took such an oath, is vouched both by Socrates and Sozomen.<sup>4</sup> But as he was looked upon by all the east, and extolled by Chrysostom, even in his lifetime, as a prelate of an unblemished character, and never reproached, even by his greatest enemies, with such an oath, in the many disputes that arose about his election, I had rather charge those two writers with one mistake more, (for they are guilty of many others), than a man of Flavi-

would more probably have had a quite contrary effect, since he had but too much room to suppose, that the strong prejudice, which they had on all occasions betrayed against him, would incline them to favor his competitor, notwithstanding the known illegality both of his election and ordination. It was therefore, upon the whole, very prudent in him to decline putting the affair upon that issue.

<sup>1</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 35.

<sup>2</sup> Theodor. Lect. l. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. p. 101.

<sup>4</sup> Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3.



Syricius dies. Was once honored as a saint. Why expunged by Baronius out of the calendar of saints. Jerom and Ruffinus quarrel.

anus' probity with such a scandalous prevarication.

Syricius did not long enjoy the satisfaction he had, to see the schism of Antioch ended in his days, and a good understanding settled anew between the east and the west. He died the same year, 398, according to the most probable opinion, on the 26th of November.<sup>1</sup> He is said, in his epitaph, quoted by Baronius,<sup>2</sup> to have been a man of a tender, compassionate, and generous temper; to have studied the happiness of the people committed to his care; to have spared no pains in procuring them the blessings that flow from peace and tranquillity; and to have screened several persons from the wrath of the emperor, to maintain the rights of the church.<sup>3</sup> He is commended by Ambrose, and the whole council of Milan, as a vigilant pastor,<sup>4</sup> by Isidore of Seville, as an illustrious pontiff;<sup>5</sup> and he has even a place among the other saints, in most of the ancient martyrologies.<sup>6</sup> However, Baronius has not thought him worthy of a place in the Roman martyrology. It is well known, that the charge of revising and correcting the Roman martyrology was committed, by pope Gregory XIII. to Baronius, with full power to reject such as he should judge unworthy, and admit others in their room, whom he should declare worthy of the public worship, and a place there. (\*) "The keys of heaven," says a modern writer, speaking of that charge, "were taken from Peter, and given to Baronius; for it was not by Peter, but by Baronius, that some were excluded from, and others admitted into, heaven."<sup>7</sup> He then shows, that by this second Minos, as he styles him, several were driven

from the seats they had long held in heaven, and to which they had a just claim, to make room for others, who had no claim. Among the former he names Syricius, whom he thinks Baronius ought to have treated in a more friendly manner, upon the recommendation of Ambrose, of the council of Milan, and of Isidore. What thus prejudiced Baronius against him, and out-weighed, in his scales, all the recommendations that could be produced in his favor, was his indifference for Jerom and Paulinus, and the kindness he showed to Ruffinus, Jerom's antagonist. Syricius, instead of protecting Jerom, as his predecessor Damasus had done, against the Roman clergy, whom he had provoked with his writings, gave him, in a manner, up to their resentment; which obliged him to abandon Rome, and return into the east, as I have related above. The name of Paulinus, afterwards bishop of Nola, is famous in the history of the church, and celebrated by Jerom, Ambrose, Austin, and all the writers of those times. He had abandoned the world, and the immense wealth he possessed, to lead a retired life; and, in the year 395, he passed through Rome, on his way to Nola, which he had chosen for the place of his retirement. The treatment he met with at Rome, from that clergy, and Syricius himself, must have been very unworthy of a man of his character, since it obliged him, as he himself writes,<sup>1</sup> to quit the city in great haste, and pursue his journey to Nola. Two years afterwards Ruffinus came to Rome, and there met with a very different reception. For Syricius received him, though violently suspected of Origenism, with the greatest marks of esteem and affection; and, after having entertained him a whole year, gave him letters of communion at his departure. Of this Jerom complains, as if advantage had been taken of the bishop of Rome's simplicity, to impose upon him.<sup>2</sup> I will not pretend, as some have done, to justify Ruffinus; but cannot help observing, that such a charge ought not to be admitted against him, upon the bare authority of Jerom, or of those who have only copied what he wrote.

Jerom and Ruffinus had lived several years in close friendship, and great intimacy; but, falling out in the year 393, their former friendship was turned at once into an open and avowed enmity. What gave occasion to this breach I shall relate hereafter, and only observe here, that Jerom not only quarreled with Ruffinus, but with all the friends of Ruffinus; nay, and with those too, who, professing an equal friendship for both, would not break with either, or any ways interfere in the quarrel. Among these was the celebrated Roman matron Melania, so frequently spoken of, and so highly commended, by Austin, by Paulinus, and, above all, by Je-

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Bolland. 22 Feb. p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad an. 398. in app. <sup>3</sup> Id. ib.

<sup>4</sup> Amb. ep. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Isid. vir. ill. c. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Florent. p. 999. Bolland. Feb. 22. p. 282.

(\*) The Roman martyrology contains the names of such saints as may be publicly worshipped, and of the places where they died, with a succinct account of the most remarkable feats which they are supposed to have performed. I said, who are publicly worshipped; for in private every one is allowed to honor, worship, and invoke whom they please, provided they have sufficient grounds to believe them in a state of happiness, or in the way to it, that is, in heaven, or in purgatory; for the souls in purgatory may be privately worshipped and invoked; nay, most of the popish divines are now of opinion, that even a canonized saint may be still in purgatory. When learning began to revive, many gross mistakes were discovered in the Roman, as well as in the other martyrologies, some being placed among the saints, and consequently worshipped as saints, who had been notoriously sinners; and others daily invoked, who had never existed. That the church therefore might be no longer misled in her worship, Gregory XIII. thought it necessary to interpose his infallible authority; and, having, accordingly, ordered Baronius to revise and correct the Roman martyrology, he confirmed, by a special bull, dated the 14th of January, 1584, all the emendations, additions, corrections, &c. which Baronius had been pleased to make, threatening with the indignation of the Almighty God, and of his apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, all who should presume to make any further alterations. And yet many alterations have been made since Gregory's time; and that many more might and ought to be made, has been sufficiently shown by many protestant, and some Roman catholic, divines.

<sup>7</sup> Aguilera santi di Palermo.

<sup>1</sup> Paul. ep. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 16. & in Ruff. l. 3. c. 6, & 7



Jerom quarrels with all the friends of Ruffinus, especially with Melania. His conduct towards her. Syricius not to be condemned on the bare authority of Jerom.

rom himself, who has filled his letters with her praises, proposing her as a true pattern of every virtue becoming her sex.

Melania had retired with Ruffinus to Jerusalem, twenty-seven years before, and continued there practising, under his direction, those works of charity, which Jerom so often admires and extols. It could not therefore be expected, that she should discard the partner of her holy life, and all her good works, as Paulinus styles him,<sup>1</sup> the minute the other was pleased to dislike him, or, indeed, that she should take any part at all in the quarrel. And yet, because she prudently declined taking part, but continued to show the same affection and esteem for Ruffinus, which she had done before; Jerom, forgetful of the regard that was due to a matron of her birth and piety, and of the high encomiums which he had himself bestowed on her, began to inveigh with no less bitterness against her, than against Ruffinus himself. In one of his letters, still extant,<sup>2</sup> after finding fault with one of Ruffinus' friends, thought to be John, bishop of Jerusalem, he adds; "But, after all, he is not so much to blame as his instructors Ruffinus and Melania, who, with a great deal of trouble and pains, have taught him to know nothing." Ruffinus tells us, that Jerom, finding that Melania, who was a matron of great judgment and penetration, did not approve of his actions and conduct, thereupon spitefully erased out of his chronicle, what he had there written in her praise.<sup>3</sup> But he did not, nor was it, perhaps, in his power to make such an alteration in all the copies; for what he is said to have cancelled, is still remaining in all the printed, as well as manuscript copies of that work, which have reached our times. Melania lived eighteen years after, steadily pursuing the same course of life, for which Jerom had once proposed her as a pattern to her whole sex.<sup>4</sup> She died at Jerusalem in the year 411, and died poor, having spent an immense estate in relieving the needy and indigent, not only of the countries where she lived, and through which she passed, but those too of the most distant provinces of the empire. For persons in poverty and distress, whether in Persia or Britain, says the author of her life,<sup>5</sup> were alike the objects of her charity, and felt alike the effects of her generosity and good nature. She died, but with her did not die the rancor and spleen which Jerom had for so many years harbored in his breast against her. For, carrying his resentment even beyond the grave, while the poor were every where bemoaning, with tears, the loss of so generous a benefactress, while the writers were paying the deserved tribute of praise to the virtues of so pious a matron, Jerom, instead of joining the rest in the com-

mon grief, strove to dry up their tears, to drown their praises, by throwing out several peevish and ill-natured reflections on the memory of the deceased. As the famous Pelagius had inscribed a book to her before he broached his opinions, Jerom, in the letter which he wrote to Ctesiphon against the Pelagians, could not forbear bringing her in, and observing on that occasion, with a malignant quibble, that the very name of Melania bespoke (in the Greek tongue), and sufficiently declared, the blackness of her treachery and perfidiousness.<sup>1</sup>

Such was the conduct of Jerom towards that illustrious matron, in her life time, and after her death. From this conduct I leave the reader to judge, whether the authority of so prejudiced a writer ought to have been of such weight with Baronius, as to make him exclude her, as well as Syricius, from the Roman martyrology, or the calendar of saints. Should we grant Ruffinus to have really held the errors which Jerom charged him with, it must still be owned, that Melania acted, as became a person of her wisdom, piety, and experience, in suspending her judgment, and not breaking with Ruffinus, till she was otherwise convinced, than by the invectives of his antagonist, equally levelled against herself, that he was no longer worthy of her friendship and regard. As for Syricius, Jerom rather commends than blames him, even where he complains of his kindness to Ruffinus. For he only says, that Ruffinus abused the simplicity of Syricius, who judged of the spirit of others from his own;<sup>2</sup> which was saying, in other words, that he was a good man, but mistaken in his judgment, or not infallible: so that his only crime, according to Jerom, was want of infallibility. However, upon the authority of that father, Baronius not only condemns the conduct of Syricius, but, rashly prying into the inscrutable secrets of Providence, pretends his days to have been shortened for the countenance he gave to Ruffinus, and the remissness he showed in suppressing the errors, with which he was charged. It is certain, that Ruffinus was well received, and entertained, in a very hospitable manner, by Syricius, during his stay at Rome; and that, upon his leaving that city, he received from him letters of communion. Now, if Syricius did not know, or did not believe, that Ruffinus held those errors, how unjust is it to blame him for the kindness he showed to a man of Ruffinus' character! If he did know, and yet gave him letters of communion, how will Baronius be able to clear Syricius from the imputation of holding the same errors?(\*)

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ad Ctes. l. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. in Ruf. l. 3. c. 6. 7.

(\*) A modern writer, (Florentinus, in vet. Mart. Hieron. p. 1001—1010.) taking the part of Syricius against Baronius, has composed a whole dissertation, and not a short one, to show "how undeservedly Syricius has been cashiered in this review of the church

<sup>3</sup> Paul. ep. 9.    <sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 101.    <sup>3</sup> Ex. Ruf. l. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Hier. ep. 99.

<sup>5</sup> Pallad. hist. Lausiaca. in Bibl. Patr. c. 118.



The misunderstanding between Syricius and Paulinus, no charge against Syricius. Anastasius writes to Paulinus. What occasioned the quarrel between Jerom and Ruffinus. Ruffinus translates Origen's Periarchon.

As for the treatment Paulinus of Nola met with from Syricius, there was, no doubt, a misunderstanding between them; but, as I am quite in the dark as to the cause of it, I will not take upon me to condemn the one rather than the other. Perhaps they were both to blame; perhaps they both meant well, and neither was to blame. However that be, the misunderstanding between them was soon removed; for, during the remaining part of Syricius' life, Paulinus went constantly to Rome once a year, as he himself declares, in one of his letters.<sup>1</sup> Syricius, it is true, did not take Jerom into his protection, as his predecessor had done, nor show him the same kindness; which is the third charge brought by Baronius against him, but of no more weight than the other two, that is, of none at all. Jerom, prompted by his zeal, and censorious temper, could not help inveigh-

ing, with great bitterness, in all his writings, against the looseness and debauchery, which universally prevailed, in his time, among the Roman clergy, and the pious frauds they made use of to extort legacies and presents from old men, from widows, and from orphans. Syricius might have been as much offended at the vices of his libertine clergy, as Jerom was, and even studied to reform them; but, at the same time, be glad, without deserving the least reproach on that score, to get rid of so troublesome a censor, who thus exposed their irregularities to the eyes, and them to the contempt, of the world. (\*)

Syricius was interred in the cemetery of Priscilla, but his body was translated, about the latter-end of the eighth century, to the church of St. Praxedes,<sup>2</sup> where his remains (for Baronius will not allow us to call them relics) still lie unregarded.

## ANASTASIUS, THIRTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.]

[Year of Christ, 398.] SYRICIUS was succeeded by Anastasius,<sup>3</sup> after a vacancy of twenty days, according to some; and, according to others, of near two months. He was no sooner chosen, than he wrote a kind and obliging letter to Paulinus, then at Nola in Campania, and another in his commendation to the bishops of that province.<sup>4</sup> This he is supposed to have done, in order to efface the bad impression, which the treatment Paulinus had met with in the time of Syricius, might have given him against that see, and the Roman clergy.

It was in the time of Anastasius, and soon after his election, that the famous dispute arose between Jerom and Ruffinus, which was afterwards carried on with warmth on both sides quite unbecoming men of their profession. Of this quarrel, and the part Anastasius acted on that occasion, the writers of those times give us the following account. Ruffinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, and a great admirer of Origen, having accompanied Melania, whom he had attended twenty-five years at Jérusalem, on her return to Rome in the time of Syricius, was received there with extraordinary marks of esteem by the Roman clergy,

and Syricius himself, as I have observed elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> Encouraged by the reception he met with, he continued a whole year at Rome; and during that time published, but without putting his name to it, a Latin translation of Origen's Periarchon, or Treatise of Principles, having first removed the prejudice which some might entertain against that writer, by the translation of an apology, which the martyr Pamphylus had composed in his vindication, while he was in prison. To this apology he added a piece of his own, showing that most of the errors ascribed to Origen had been maliciously inserted into his works by his enemies after his death.<sup>6</sup> In the preface to the Periarchon itself he also declared, that, in imitation of a learned brother, meaning Jerom, who had translated above seventy of Origen's books, he had either corrected or suppressed such errors as had appeared to him repugnant to the articles of the catholic faith.<sup>7</sup> The work, thus recommended, was

triumphant, while many others passed muster for great saints, whose virtues," he might have said, whose very existence, "may be justly disputed." I shall not enter into the tedious detail of his arguments and reasons, but only observe, that the name of Syricius should not have been struck out of the calendar, while the names of the Arian pope Liberius, and the anti-pope Felix, his antagonist, were kept in; though, upon other accounts, I think him myself very unworthy of the name of a saint.

<sup>1</sup> Paul. ep. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 24. Soz. l. 7. c.

<sup>4</sup> Paul. ep. 16.

<sup>3</sup> 34. Aug. de civ. Dei.

(\*) The festival of Syricius was never kept, it seems, by public authority; but is marked in some ancient martyrologies, on the 22d of February, and in others on the 26th of November. The last was more probably the day of his death, since he is said, both by Prosper and Isidore, to have governed fourteen years, to complete which one month only will be wanting, if we place his death on that day; and several, if with Baronius we suppose him to have died on the 22d of February; (a) for, as to the year of his death there is no disagreement among authors. Baronius mentions an ancient picture, part whereof, says he, is still to be seen in the title of pope Syricius. (b) But that picture is no more to be seen, and he explains himself no farther.

(a) Vid. Boll. 22 Feb. p. 282.

(b) Bar. ad ann. 395. n. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Vide. Boll. prop. p. 59. <sup>5</sup> Page 124.

<sup>6</sup> Hier. Apol. l. 2. ep. 75, <sup>7</sup> Id. ap. l. advers. Ruff. & dial. advers. Pelag.



Many at Rome embrace the errors of Origen. Errors left in the work, notwithstanding the corrections made by the translator. Jerom's charge against Ruffinus. Ruffinus' answer. Jerom condemns Origen, and inveighs against Ruffinus. Origen condemned by Anastasius and several other bishops.

received with uncommon applause at Rome, and the sentiments of Origen greedily embraced, and warmly maintained, by great numbers of the clergy as well as the laity, to whom Origen had till then been, it seems, utterly unknown. This happened in the time of Syricius, who, either not suspecting Ruffinus, as he had not put his name to the translation, or perhaps not judging him worthy of censure for barely relating the sentiments of another, or supposing that, agreeably to his preface, he had suppressed whatever was wrong in the original work, gave him letters of communion at his departure from Rome: for he had no sooner published his translation than he left that city and returned to Aquileia. Syricius died soon after, and Anastasius who was no sooner chosen in his room, than the famous Roman matron Marcella, offended at the new doctrines that began to prevail in Rome, applied to him, pressing him to put a stop to the growing evil, and at the same time accusing Ruffinus as the author of the translation, to which alone it was owing.<sup>1</sup> To make good this charge, she produced some copies corrected with Ruffinus' own hand; and several persons appeared, who, having by her means been reclaimed from the errors of Origen, owned they had been led into them by the disciples of Ruffinus.<sup>2</sup> This Jerom cannot relate without launching into the praises of his heroine Marcella, crying up her zeal, extolling her courage and resolution, in thus making head against so numerous a band, meaning the Origenists in Rome, while the clergy declined that trouble, or rather promoted the doctrines they ought to have opposed. But elsewhere he will not allow women, under any pretence whatsoever, to concern themselves in religious controversies. "To meddle in disputes concerning faith or religion, is not at all the province (says he, with the words of St. Paul) of silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."<sup>3</sup> But he speaks here of Melania, who was no less attached to Ruffinus than Marcella was to him.

In the Periarchon were contained, without all doubt, many unsound and unwarrantable notions, and Ruffinus corrected those only that related to the Trinity. "He corrected," says Jerom, "what Origen had impiously written concerning the Trinity, being well apprised it would have given great offence at Rome. But as to his other errors, those especially concerning the fall of the angels, and the first man, the resurrection, the world or worlds of Epicurus, the restoration of all things, &c., he either left them, as he found them in the original, or confirmed them with reasons borrowed from the comment of Didy-

mus, an avowed defender of Origen. Thus he declared himself a catholic with respect to the Trinity, that in other points the reader might not be aware of him as a heretic."<sup>1</sup>

In answer to this charge, Ruffinus declared, that it was never his intention to correct all the errors that were ascribed to Origen; that the declaration he had made, in his preface to the Periarchon, ought to be restrained to those errors only that related to the Trinity; and that it was very uncharitable to judge of his faith, from the faith of the author he translated, and not from his own words. He then declares his sentiments touching some particular points, in which Origen was thought to differ from the church; adding, that where Origen differed from the catholic church, he differed from Origen.

Anastasius, notwithstanding the solicitations of Marcella, declined either proceeding against Ruffinus, or censuring his translation, till two years after, when Jerom, in a new version which he published of the same work, undertook to prove, that several opinions of Origen were truly heretical, and as such ought to be condemned by the church. As to Ruffinus, he inveighed bitterly against him, as if he had translated that work with no other view but to propagate the errors it contained. Thus began the famous quarrel between these two writers, which occasioned no small disturbance in the church, some siding with Jerom against Ruffinus, and others with Ruffinus against Jerom. Among the former, the most sanguine were Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia, in the island of Cyprus, and Anastasius, bishop of Rome. Theophilus not only condemned in a council, which he summoned for that purpose, the errors of Origen, but Origen himself, declaring him a heretic, and forbidding all under his jurisdiction to read, or even keep his works by them; which is the first instance we have of such prohibitions. His example was followed by Epiphanius, Anastasius, Venerius, bishop of Milan, Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, and several others. But some, and among the rest John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Chrysostom, then bishop of Constantinople, disapproving the rash conduct of their colleagues, could by no means be induced to confirm the sentence they had pronounced; which Epiphanius resented to such a degree, that he immediately separated himself from their communion. Sozomen adds, that he even refused to pray for young Theodosius, while he was dangerously ill, because his mother Eudoxia would not banish from Constantinople some monks who had warmly espoused the cause of Origen.<sup>2</sup> Ruffinus ranks Epiphanius among those plagiarists, who, borrowing from Origen all they said or wrote, cried down his works,

<sup>1</sup> Id. ib.<sup>2</sup> Id. ib.<sup>3</sup> Id. & Ctesiphont. advers. Peleg. Tim. 2. c. iii. v. 6, 7.<sup>1</sup> Id. apol. 1. advers. Ruff.<sup>2</sup> Soz. 1. 8. c. 15.



[Ruffinus is summoned to Rome. Anastasius separates himself from his communion.]

in order to deter others from reading them, and consequently from discovering, that what was admired in them was not their own.<sup>1</sup>

Origen being thus condemned as a heretic, near one hundred and fifty years after his death, Anastasius, at the instigation of Marcella, Pammachius, Oceanus, and some other of Jerom's friends in Rome, wrote to Ruffinus complaining of his translation, and summoning him to appear, and give an account of his faith. In answer to this letter, Ruffinus sent him a confession of faith entirely agreeable to that of the catholic church, adding, that he held no other; that his faith had been sufficiently tried in the persecution of Valens; and that, as to the translation of Origen's work, he had there neither approved nor disapproved, but barely related, the sentiments of that writer. He modestly declined complying with the summons calling him to Rome; and concluded with declaring, that the faith of the Roman church and his were one and the same.<sup>2</sup> (\*)

<sup>1</sup> Hier. in Ruff. l. 2. c. 6. l. 3. c. 7. & Ruff. ad Orig.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. in Ruff. c. 6, 7. ep. 16. 78.

(\*) The chief errors of Origen were concerning the Trinity, the resurrection of the body, the eternity of hell torments, and the origin of souls. If his works were not interpolated by the heretics, as Ruffinus pretended they were, it is no easy matter to determine what was his real opinion with respect to the Trinity; for in some passages he seems to acknowledge an equality, and in others to establish an inequality, between the Father and the Son. As to the resurrection, he was accused of not believing, that the body, at least the same body, was to rise from the dead. He denied the eternity of hell torments, and held, that even the devils would repent in the end, and be saved. He maintained the souls to have been created before the world; to have been confined to the bodies, which they animated, as so many prisons, to expiate there the sins which they had committed; to be in perpetual motion passing from one body to another, and at last to become angels. With the three last errors chiefly Ruffinus was charged by St. Jerom; and it was to clear himself from such an imputation, that, in his answer to Anastasius summoning him to Rome, he declared his belief with respect to those articles, styling his answer on that account an apology. As to the Trinity, those whom they called Origenists, were allowed, even by their enemies, to be quite orthodox in their belief of that mystery. Touching the resurrection, Ruffinus declared and explained his faith in such clear terms as ought to have left no room, even for St. Jerom, to arraign him on that head. He expressed himself in a manner no less orthodox with respect to the eternity of the pains of hell. But, as to the origin of souls, he owns himself to be quite at a loss what to think, and what to determine, on that subject, since no particular opinion had been yet settled by the church, and the ecclesiastical writers disagreed in that point among themselves; some believing, with Tertullian and Lactantius, the souls to have been formed with the bodies; and others maintaining, with Origen, that they were all created before the world: as to himself, he declared, that he held nothing for certain but what he was taught by the church, namely, that the souls as well as the bodies proceeded from God. (a) This Jerom called a false, artful, and imposing confession, as if Ruffinus did not believe what he professed in the most solemn manner to believe; and Anastasius, judging of his faith not from his own words, but from those of Jerom, separated himself from his communion.

I cannot help observing here, that Jerom, whom nothing now will satisfy but the condemnation of Origen, used a few years before to inveigh with the same gall and bitterness against the enemies of that writer as he does now against his friends, condemning with as much acrimony those who accused him,

(a) Ruff. ad Anast. p. 202.

But this confession, however orthodox, did not satisfy Anastasius, or rather Jerom and his friends in Rome. They continued, says Ruffinus, the persecution which they had so successfully begun, and with their malicious suggestions prevailed in the end on Anastasius to comply with their unjust demands;<sup>1</sup> that is, I suppose, to separate himself from his communion: for Anastasius, in his answer to a letter which John, bishop of Jerusalem, had wrote in favor of Ruffinus, acquaints that prelate, that he had cut him off from his communion, and left him to be judged by God and his own conscience. "As to Origen," says he in the same letter, "I knew not before who he was, nor what he had wrote. Ruffinus has translated him into our language; and, in doing so, what else could he have in view but to infect this church with his pernicious doctrines? He has expressed his own sentiments in translating those of his author; and is therefore no less guilty than Origen himself, whom we have all condemned."<sup>2</sup>(\*)

as he now does those who excuse him. Origen had been condemned in his lifetime by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, and by several other bishops: and Jerom, after telling us, in speaking of the judgment that was given against him, that he had written more books than others had time to read; and that in the number of his volumes he had surpassed Varro, and the other most eloquent writers both Greek and Latin; adds, "But what reward did he receive for so much toil and labor? He was condemned by the bishop Demetrius; and, if we except the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phœnicia, and Achaia, he was condemned by all the rest. Even Rome assembled her senate against him, not because he taught any new doctrines, or held any heretical opinions, which those who snarl at him, like so many mad dogs, would fain make us believe; but because they could not bear the bright rays of his eloquence and knowledge, and were forced to be dumb when he spoke." This passage is quoted by Ruffinus, and Jerom himself owns it, to have been copied from his letter to Paula. (a)

By the senate that Rome assembled against Origen, Jerom meant, no doubt, the bishop and clergy of that city: and that he made no account of their judgment, sufficiently appears from the contemptuous and ironical manner he speaks of it. However, that father is brought in by Baronius as an evidence for infallibility, on account of the regard which he afterwards paid to the judgment of Anastasius, styling it a decisive sentence. But Jerom had then changed his opinion; and Anastasius only condemned what he had condemned before; so that from the great regard which Jerom showed on that occasion for the judgment of Anastasius, Baronius can at most conclude, that he thought the popes infallible when they agreed with him; for that he thought them fallible when they disagreed with him, is manifest from his not acquiescing in the judgment of another pope condemning Origen, when he himself had not yet condemned him.

(a) Hier. vir. illustr. c. 54. Ruff. l. 2. p. 225.

<sup>1</sup> Idem ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.

(\*) The same charge lies against Jerom; nay, he was the more guilty of the two. For he had not only translated many of Origen's works, containing errors no less repugnant to the catholic truths than any in the Periarchon, but had besides filled his comments on the Scripture, especially on the epistle to the Ephesians, with the worst of Origen's errors, namely, with those relating to the resurrection of the body, to the pre-existence of the souls, and to the duration of hell-torments, as is manifest from the many passages quoted by Ruffinus out of the comments of that father. Jerom found great fault with Ruffinus, for not confuting the errors which he translated; concluding from thence, that he held the same doctrines: and yet he was himself so far from confuting in his comments any of Origen's erroneous opinions, that on the contrary he often delivered them in such manner as made many,



The condemnation of Origen owing chiefly to the bishop of Alexandria. The bishop of Aquileia communicates with Ruffinus, though excommunicated by Anastasius. Ruffinus unjustly condemned.

In the same letter Anastasius mentions with great joy a decree of the emperor, that is, of Arcadius and Honorius, forbidding the works of Origen, and imposing severe penalties on such as should for the future read or peruse them. (\*)

Such is the account the contemporary writers, and Jerom himself, give us of the condemnation of Origen, and his interpreter, Ruffinus, very different from that which we read in Baronius, introducing his high pontiff Anastasius as acting the first part on that occasion; though Jerom tells us, in express terms, that Anastasius followed the example of Theophilus; that he condemned in the west, what had before been condemned in the east;<sup>1</sup> and that Rome and all Italy owed their deliverance to the letters of Theophilus;<sup>2</sup> meaning the circular letter, which Theophilus wrote to all the catholic bishops, acquainting them that he had condemned Origen, and prohibited his books, and exhorting them to follow his example.<sup>3</sup> It was by this letter that Anastasius was induced to condemn Origen: for what else could Jerom mean by saying, that Rome and Italy were, by the letters of Theophilus, delivered from the errors of Origen? Baronius could not but know, that the letter of Theophilus was addressed to all the catholic bishops, since it is styled by Theophilus himself, in a letter he wrote to Epiphanius,<sup>4</sup> and by Epiphanius, in one of his letters to Jerom,<sup>5</sup> "a general letter to all catholics:" and yet the annalist speaks of it as directed to Anastasius alone, in order to impose by that means on his readers, and persuade them, "that the bishop of Alexandria submitted the sentence he had pronounced to

and St. Austin among the rest, believe them to be his own. (a) Nay, in one place he seems to own, that he held some of Origen's errors: (b) but ends what he there writes of him thus: "If you believe me, I never was an Origenist; but if you absolutely insist upon my having been one, I now tell you, that I am so no more; and it is to convince you of this, that I am become the accuser of Origen."

(\*) Ruffinus pretended this letter to be supposititious, and to have been forged by St. Jerom, alleging, that he could not believe the bishop of Rome capable of such a crying piece of injustice as to condemn an innocent man, and condemn him in his absence. He added, that if Anastasius had ever written such a letter to John of Jerusalem, John, with whom he lived in great intimacy, would have acquainted him with it, which he had not done. In answer to this charge, Jerom refers him to the archives of the Roman church; (c) and to Jerom I refer the Jesuit Halloix, supposing the letter to have been feigned, though not by St. Jerom, on account of the following words, that seem to wound the pretended supremacy. "I have entirely separated myself from him," meaning Ruffinus: "I will not even know where he is, or what he is doing: let him try, if he pleases, to be absolved elsewhere." So that Anastasius thought he might be absolved elsewhere, though condemned at Rome. This Halloix, more jealous of the papal supremacy than the pope himself, will not allow, and therefore pretends the letter to be supposititious. But, since the time of Ruffinus, none besides he ever questioned its authenticity.

(a) Hier. ep. 89.

(b) Hier. ep. 65.

(c) Hier. in Ruff. l. 3. c. 5, & 6.

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ep. 78.

<sup>2</sup> Id. ep. 71.

<sup>3</sup> Id. ep. 6. 69, 70.

<sup>4</sup> Id. ep. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Id. ep. 73.

the judgment of Anastasius, being well apprised, that it could be of no weight unless confirmed by the first see." Had he been well apprised of this, I cannot think he would have pronounced such a sentence, as it is very certain he did, without the authority, the advice, or even the knowledge, of the "first see."

As to Ruffinus, Anastasius, it is true, separated himself from his communion; but did not excommunicate him, that is, as the word is now understood, did not cut him off from the communion of the catholic church, as Baronius insinuates. The power of excommunicating him in this sense was by the canons vested in his own bishop; and it is manifest from Jerom, that Chromatius, then bishop of Aquileia, continued to communicate with him after Anastasius had renounced his communion; nay, after Chromatius himself had condemned Origen, and the Origenists,<sup>1</sup> that is, those who held the errors of Origen. A plain proof, that the bishop Aquileia did not acquiesce in the judgment of Anastasius in ranking Ruffinus among them. And truly the only charge brought against him by Anastasius, in his letter to John of Jerusalem, was his having translated Origen into the Latin tongue, without pointing out his errors, or offering any arguments to confute them. Thence he was by Jerom induced to conclude, that Ruffinus held the same errors. "What could Ruffinus propose," says he in his letter, "by translating Origen into the Roman language? Had he exposed the execrable errors his work contains, and raised in his readers that indignation which the author deserves, I should rather have praised than blamed him. But he has in his mind consented to those errors, and in translating the sentiments of Origen expressed his own."<sup>2</sup> This Ruffinus denied, declaring, with the words of Origen, in his preface to the Periarchon,<sup>3</sup> that he embraced nothing as truth, that any ways differed from the received doctrines of the catholic church: nay, he was so far from defending any of Origen's errors, which seemed to him repugnant to the catholic truths, that in the apology he composed in defence of that writer, as well as in the preface which he prefixed to his translation, he undertook to prove, that those errors were not his, but had been maliciously inserted into his works, either by his enemies to eclipse his reputation, or by heretics, who had fathered upon him their own doctrines, with a view of recommending them to the world by the authority of so great and so venerable a name.<sup>4</sup> He followed therein the example of the most eminent writers, and the greatest lights of the church, namely, of the martyr Pamphylus,<sup>5</sup> of Athanasius,<sup>6</sup> Ba-

<sup>1</sup> Apol. l. 3. c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.

<sup>3</sup> Præf. ad Periarch. p. 665.

<sup>4</sup> Apol. pro Orig. apud Hier. t. 4. p. 194, 195. & præf. ad Periarch.

<sup>5</sup> Phot. c. 118.

<sup>6</sup> Athan. de Nicæn. decret. p. 277. Concil. t. 5. p. 652. Phot. c. 232.



Origen excused by some of the fathers, and once by Jerom himself. The bishops of Africa apply to Anastasius and Venerius of Milan. Anastasius advises the bishops of Africa not to dissemble the cruelties of the Donatists. Who refuse to comply with his advice.

zil,<sup>1</sup> his brother Gregory of Nyssa,<sup>2</sup> Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>3</sup> and many others, who out of the great regard they had for a man of Origen's piety and learning, either ascribed to others the errors they found in his works, or excused them, by putting on his words the most charitable construction they could bear. Jerom himself had been formerly one of Origen's greatest admirers, had translated above seventy of his books, and thought he could not employ his time better than in enriching the Latin tongue with the works of "the best writer and first doctor of the church after the apostles,"<sup>4</sup> as he then styled him. As Rufinus, in his translation of the Periarchon, endeavored to excuse the errors of Origen, so had Jerom done before him in translating his other works, choosing rather to "veil and excuse," than expose the faults of one whom in other respects he so much admired.<sup>5</sup> But this admiration being afterwards changed into an open and avowed enmity, "the first doctor of the church after the apostles" became at once not only an "heterodox, but an impious writer;" all who stood up in his defence were arraigned of the same "pestilential doctrines;" and what was found amiss in his works was no longer "veiled or excused," but set out in the worst light. (\*)

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 5. p. 653.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. c. 232. & Nyss. in Cant. t. 1. p. 473.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. or. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. de nom. Heb. p. 299.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. ep. 65.

(\*) Some of the fathers would not allow even his doctrine concerning the Trinity to be heterodox. For some passages being quoted out of his works by the Arians to confirm their opinions, Basil and Nazianzen undertook to prove, from other passages, that his sentiments with respect to the Trinity were quite orthodox; and that the Arians had either out of malice misinterpreted, or out of ignorance misunderstood his meaning, not being capable of fathoming the depth of his thoughts. (a) It must be owned, that Origen, in several places, speaks of the Trinity agreeably to the sentiments of the church, acknowledging "the Son to have been from the beginning in the Father; to be the image of the Father; to have been begotten by him from all eternity; to be the wisdom of God; to be God, though not the source and origin of the Divinity, as the Father, whom on that account he styles Autotheos; to be above all creatures; to have the same power as the Father, and to deserve the same honor and worship." But elsewhere he uses expressions that can no way bear an orthodox sense, namely, that "the word is an hypostasis different from the Father;" meaning by the word "hypostasis" nature and substance; "that the Father and Son are one by concord and union; that the Son is not properly God, but called God, because he is the image of the Divinity; that the Word and the Holy Ghost were made by the Father; that the Father is greater than the Son; that the Son is inferior to the Father, though far above all creatures, as the ray of the sun is inferior to the sun;" and lastly "that the Son is the minister of the Father." In these passages is contained a very different doctrine from that which is laid down in those I have quoted above: and hence some of the friends of Origen, and among the rest Rufinus, concluded the latter passages to have been foisted in by the Arians, denying the Divinity of the Word; while others, allowing them to be Origen's, undertook to explain them in a catholic sense, in opposition to the Arians confirming their doctrine with the authority of so eminent a writer. But his enemies, attending only to the passages where he seemed to establish an inequality in the Trinity, not only condemned him as a heretic, but all who stood up in his defence, or attempted to interpret his words in a catholic sense.

(a) Socr. l. 4. c. 26.

But what seems most of all surprising, and quite unaccountable, in the conduct of that father, is, that though he had with so much noise procured Origen to be condemned as a heretic, and his books to be prohibited, particularly his Periarchon, or, as some will have it, the Periarchon alone, as containing most of his heretical tenets; yet, in a private letter to Paulinus, he refers him to that very piece for the decision of some questions of the greatest importance.<sup>1</sup> But to return to Anastasius.

The same year, 401, in which Origen was condemned, the churches of Africa being greatly distressed for want of ecclesiastics, the bishops of the province of Carthage, assembling under Aurelius, bishop of that city, resolved to despatch one of their body into Italy, to acquaint Anastasius, and Venerius, bishop of Milan, with the condition of the African churches, and implore their assistance.<sup>2</sup> Which of the bishops was charged with this legation, or what success attended it, we are no where told. But as Paulinus, who afterwards wrote the life of St. Ambrose, and belonged to the church of Milan, was at this time sent into Africa, and continued there, some have not improbably conjectured, that Venerius at least assisted his colleagues in Africa with a supply of as many ecclesiastics as he could spare. Baronius supposes Anastasius to have relieved those churches with the like supply; but this supposition he builds upon the paternal care which Anastasius had, as universal pastor, of all the catholic churches,<sup>3</sup> which is building on a false foundation.

The same year another council was held at Carthage, consisting of all the bishops of Africa; and Aurelius, who presided in this, as he had done in the former, opened it with reading a letter from Anastasius, exhorting the bishops of Africa no longer to dissemble the cruelties of the Donatists, who continued to use with great barbarity the catholic bishops and clergy.<sup>4</sup> The fathers of the council returned Anastasius thanks for his advice; but, not thinking it quite agreeable to the true spirit of Christianity, they declined complying with it. They knew that their persecutors, had they complained of their cruelties to the civil magistrate, would have been punished with death; pursuant to a law enacted against them, three years before, by the emperors Arcadius and Honorius.<sup>5</sup> They therefore chose, notwithstanding the advice of Anastasius, rather to suffer with patience a most cruel persecution, than redeem themselves from it at so dear a rate.<sup>6</sup> In the same council, it was decreed, among other things, that such of the Donatist clergy, as should return to the church, might be admitted, if

<sup>1</sup> Hier. ep. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1642.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 401, n. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. t. 1. inter Concil. Afr. c. 33.

<sup>5</sup> Cod. Theod. l. 3. de episc. & cler. & Greg. l. 1. ep.



Anastasius dies. Is greatly commended by Jerom. Is honored as a saint. An ill-timed observation of Baronius. The election of Innocent commended by the ancients. He writes to Anysius of Thessalonica.

the bishop, who received them, thought it expedient, to the same rank which they had enjoyed before their conversion. As a decree had been lately enacted by Anastasius, and the other Italian bishops, excluding converted heretics from the catholic clergy;<sup>1</sup> it was to acquaint them with the motives which had prompted the fathers assembled at Carthage to admit the Donatists, that Aurelius and his colleagues wrote to Anastasius, and not to beg of him a dispensation in favor of the converted Donatists, as is ridiculously supposed by Baronius.<sup>2</sup>

This is all I find recorded of Anastasius, by the ancient writers. He died on the 27th of April, 402, after having held the see of Rome four years, one month, and thirteen days. Jerom, with whom he sided against Rufinus, and the other friends of Origen, distinguishes him with the title of an eminent man; and adds, "that Rome did not deserve to enjoy him long, lest the head of the world should be cut off under such a bishop; nay, he was snatched away," says he, "lest he should strive to ward off, with his prayers, the execution of the sentence that was already pronounced; the Lord saying to Jeremiah, pray not for this people for their good: when they fast, I will not hear their cry," &c.<sup>3</sup> Jerom speaks there of the calamities that befel Rome seven years after, when it was taken by the Goths, under Alaric. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, not only an avowed

enemy to Origen, but a cruel persecutor of all who stood up in his defence, extols Anastasius for his pastoral care, and indefatigable pains, in preserving and maintaining the purity of the catholic faith;<sup>4</sup> alluding, no doubt, to his acting in concert with him, against Origen, and the pretended Origenists. Be that as it will, Anastasius is now honored as a saint by the church of Rome; and the honors paid him are chiefly owing to the commendations of Jerom and Theophilus, whose party he so warmly espoused. As to the writings of Anastasius, mention is made by Jerom, of several letters written by him on different occasions; but that alone has reached our times, which he wrote to John, bishop of Jerusalem, and some fragments of another to one Ursinus, on the Incarnation.(\*).

Baronius observes, at the death of Syricius,<sup>5</sup> that such popes as did not, through sloth and indolence, exert the due zeal in extirpating the heterodox opinions that sprung up in the church, that is, such popes as did not exterminate all who differed in opinion from them, have been quickly cut off, to make room for other more zealous asserters of the purity of the faith. An ill-timed observation! which I might retort here, were I inclined to indulge such a humor, since the indolent Syricius enjoyed his dignity thirteen years (and not very many have enjoyed it longer) and the very zealous Anastasius only four.

## INNOCENT, THIRTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ARCADIUS, HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER.]

[Year of Christ 402.] On the demise of Anastasius, Innocent was immediately, and with one consent, chosen by the clergy and the people.<sup>6</sup> He was, according to Anastasius,<sup>7</sup> a native of Albano, and the son of another Innocent; but, according to Jerom, both the son and successor of Anastasius.<sup>8</sup> Theodoret styles him a man of great address, and a lively genius;<sup>9</sup> Prosper, a worthy successor of St. Peter;<sup>10</sup> and Austin distinguishes him, after his death, with the title of the Blessed Innocent.<sup>11</sup> Orosius says, that God withdrew that holy bishop from Rome, when the city was taken, as he did Lot from Sodom;<sup>12</sup> and Jerom, in writing to Demetrias, exhorts her to adhere steadily to the faith of Innocent.<sup>13</sup> Austin, in the letter he wrote to him in the name of the council of Milevum, ascribes his

election to a particular Providence; and adds, that the fathers of the Council thought it a duty incumbent upon them to suggest to him what might be done for the good of the church, since they could not think him capable of hearing any thing of that nature with contempt or indifference.<sup>14</sup>

Innocent was no sooner chosen and ordained, than he wrote to Anysius of Thessalonica, acquainting him with his election, and charging him, as his three immediate predecessors had done, with the care of the churches of

<sup>4</sup> Justin. in ep. ad Menan.

\* The two decretals that have been transmitted to us under his name are evidently supposititious, the one being dated fourteen years before his election, and the other fourteen years after his death. One of these pretended decretals is addressed to the German and Burgundian bishops, though nothing is more certain, than that the Burgundians were not converted to the Christian religion till many years after his death, till the year 436, if Socrates is to be credited. (a) They are both made up of several passages taken from the letters of Innocent, Leo, Gregory, and others; and were, in all likelihood, forged, as many others have been, by Isidorus Mercator.

(a) Socr. l. 7. c. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Ad ann. 397, num. 21.

<sup>14</sup> Aug. ep. 92.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1642.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. ep. 16. Jerom. c. xiv. ver. 11, 12.

<sup>7</sup> Anast. c. 41.

<sup>9</sup> Theod. l. 5. c. 35.

<sup>11</sup> Pec. orig. c. 9.

<sup>13</sup> Hier. ubi supra.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 14.

<sup>6</sup> Collect. Rem. ab Holsten. p. 45.

<sup>8</sup> Hier. ep. 8.

<sup>10</sup> Prosp. in Col. c. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Oros. l. 7. c. 39.



Innocent's letter to Victricius. The articles it contains. Innocent thinks the marriage of a woman with another man valid, while her husband is still alive. The unchristian severity of one of these articles ill excused by Baronius.

East Illyricum.<sup>1</sup> In the end of the following year, 403, the emperor Honorius visited the city of Rome; and, during his stay there, Innocent went frequently to wait on him, in order to obtain, in behalf of some bishops, and other ecclesiastics, an exemption from executing certain civil offices hereditary in their families. He succeeded in his suit; but it cost him a great deal of trouble and uneasiness.<sup>2</sup> Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, who happened to be then at Rome, having applied to him for information, with respect to the practice and discipline of the Roman church, Innocent, to gratify him, and "that he might not seem to approve, by his silence, the abuses that prevailed in some churches," sent him a Book of Rules, as he styled it, containing several regulations, which had been originally established, says he, by the authority of the apostles and fathers, but were now, in many places, either quite unknown, or utterly neglected. He therefore entreats Victricius to communicate them to the neighboring churches and bishops, that they might be acquainted with the discipline of the Roman church, and conform to it in instructing the new converted Christians.<sup>3</sup>

This Book of Rules contains thirteen regulations relating to different points of discipline, whereof the first forbids, and declares uncanonical, the ordination of bishops without the knowledge and approbation of their metropolitans. The second excludes from the clerical order such as have served, or shall continue to serve, in war after baptism. The third orders all differences and disputes, arising among the ecclesiastics, to be decided by the bishops of the provinces, saving the rights of the Roman church;\* and commands those to be deposed who shall recur to other tribunals, except in causes of the greatest importance, when, after the bishops have given sentence, recourse may be had to the apostolical see, pursuant to the order of the council, meaning, no doubt, the council of Sardica.<sup>4</sup> The three next relate to those who shall have married a widow, a woman that has been divorced, or a second wife, either before or after baptism; and they are all alike declared incapable of being ever admitted among the clergy. The seventh forbids bishops to ordain clerks of another church, without the permission of their own bishops, or to admit those to serve one church who have been deposed in another. The eighth allows the Novatians and Donatists, who return to the church, to be re-admitted by the bare imposition of hands; but subjects those to a long penance, who had quitted the church to be re-baptized by them. The ninth relates to the celibacy of the priests and deacons, who are debarred by it from all commerce with their

wives, after ordination. The inferior clergy were allowed to marry; but Innocent, by the tenth article of the present letter, excepts those who, before they were admitted among the clergy, had lived in monasteries, and professed continence there; it being fit, says he, they should observe in a higher rank what they had observed when only monks. In the same article he observes, that those who had lost their virginity before marriage, did not receive the blessing of the church when they afterwards married; and that it was the ancient practice of the church, that such as had lost it before baptism, should promise, before they were admitted to the clerical order, never to marry. The eleventh forbids those to be ordained who were not exempted from all civil offices and employments, such offices diverting them from the functions of the priesthood, and sometimes obliging them to exhibit shows and public sports, of which the devil was, without all doubt, the author and promoter. The twelfth forbids women, who have married a second husband, their first being still alive, to be admitted to repentance, or allowed to do penance, till one of the two dies. The same discipline is to be observed, according to this article, with respect to the virgins, who, after consecrating their virginity to Jesus Christ, shall, either by a public marriage, or by private fornication, violate the faith they had pledged to their immortal Spouse.

Baronius,<sup>1</sup> to answer the objections which some innovators, as he is pleased to style them, have offered against the unchristian severity of this article, tells us, that the repentance of such a virgin can by no means be sincere, so long as she continues with the man she married; which is quite foreign to the purpose, since Innocent excludes her from repentance, not only so long as she lives with him, but so long as he lives. Innocent knew what Baronius seems not to have known; namely, that the marriage of virgins, however solemnly consecrated, held good, even according to the practice of the Roman church;<sup>2</sup> and, consequently, that they could not abandon their husbands; and hence he would not admit them to repentance, or the participation of the sacred mysteries, till the death of their husbands; which was keeping them, as it were, in a state of excommunication, without any possible means of redeeming themselves from it. And it is this uncharitable severity, which some divines of the reformed churches have deservedly blamed. Baronius stigmatizes such marriages with the name of adultery; but he confounds the time of Innocent with his own; for in his time, the vow of chastity was declared a true marriage, and, consequently, every subsequent marriage void and null; but, in Innocent's time, the mar-

<sup>1</sup> Coll. Rom. p. 46, 47.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1252.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 1249.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 120, 121.

\* In some editions this clause is wanting.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 404. num. 130.

<sup>2</sup> See Natal. Alex. hist. eccles. t. 10. p. 14.



Letter of the council of Carthage to Innocent. Innocent writes to the bishops of Spain. Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, recurs to Innocent.

riage of a sacred virgin was held valid, though commonly deemed sinful. Whether it be sinful or no, or whether a vow of that kind can be lawfully made, I shall not take upon me to determine here; but I am very confident, that of most persons, who debar themselves by a solemn vow from ever marrying, we may say, with the fathers of the eighth council of Toledo, "That they had better break a vow, which they had rashly made, than fill up, by observing it, the measure of their sins."

But to return to the letter: the thirteenth and last article will have those virgins to do penance for some time, who shall marry after having promised to live virgins, though they had not yet received the sacred veil.<sup>1</sup> This letter has been inserted by Dionysius Exiguus, in his code of the Roman church, and is quoted by the second council of Tours, held in 567,<sup>2</sup> and by several other councils.<sup>3</sup> (\*)

In the year 404, Austin wrote to Innocent, in the name of the bishops assembled in council at Carthage, entreating him to apply to Honorius for new laws against the Donatists; whose cruelties towards the orthodox, if not magnified by Austin,<sup>4</sup> are scarce to be matched in history. The emperor hearkened to Innocent's remonstrances, and severe laws being

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1249—1252.    <sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 5. p. 858, &  
<sup>3</sup> See Blond. Decr. p. 55.    866.

(\*) And yet some have been induced, by the date it bears, to question its authenticity. For it is dated the 15th of February, 404. Now, it is manifest, say they, from the letter itself, that Victricius was at Rome while the emperor Honorius was there; and it is no less certain, that Honorius did not arrive at Rome till the month of December, 403. If therefore Victricius was at Rome in December, 403, it is not at all probable, that Innocent should have written to him on the 15th of February, 404. To solve this difficulty, some suppose Victricius to have applied to Innocent, while he was still at Rome; and Innocent, instead of informing him, as he might, by word of mouth, to have given him in writing the desired instructions, that, having thus more weight, they might the more readily be complied with by other bishops. But it is manifest, from Innocent's words, that his letter was an answer to one from Victricius; and we cannot well suppose Victricius, who was at Rome in December, to have returned to Rouen, to have written from thence to Innocent, and Innocent to have returned him so full an answer by the 15th of the following January. We may conclude the year to have been, by some mistake, altered, and 404, inserted in the date instead of 405, since the letter could not be written earlier, as I have just observed, than the month of January (if January was the true month) of the latter year; and we have no reason to think it was written later. The mistake as to the year might have been occasioned by the transcriber's omitting P. C. "Post Consulatum Honorii," and thereby confounding the year of the emperor's sixth consulship, 404, with the year after it, 405. Such omissions frequently occur, and have led writers, not aware of them, into great mistakes, in point of chronology, or made them suspect, nay, and condemn, as spurious, the most authentic pieces of history. This letter, in some editions, bears no date; and F. Labbé assures us, that he has seen a manuscript copy of it, in which the date was wanting. Some therefore suppose the date to have been afterwards added, nay, and the whole conclusion of the letter. For Innocent closes it by saying, that the observance of the rules it contains will banish all ambition among the bishops, compose all differences, prevent all schisms, and leave no room for the devil to insult the flock of Christ. A conclusion taken probably from some other piece, and not at all adapted or applicable, with truth, to this.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. ep. 50.

issued against them, they began by that means to be convinced of their errors, and to return daily in great numbers to the unity of the church. This is what we read in one of Austin's letters;<sup>1</sup> for the Donatists, as he would make us believe, finding themselves persecuted, began to inquire, which they had never done before, into the grounds of the religion, for which they suffered. This inquiry had the desired effect; their eyes were opened; they discovered the errors of their sect; and, being sensible of their folly in foregoing any temporal advantage, or exposing themselves to the least inconvenience, for the sake of such a religion, they sincerely abjured it, and zealously embraced the catholic faith. An ingenious term, I must own, to excuse, nay, and to authorize and sanctify the greatest barbarities! But daily experience teaches us, that persecution has a contrary effect, and that the more men are persecuted, the more obstinately they adhere to the opinions, however absurd, for which they suffer; witness the great number of martyrs which almost every church, as well as the catholic, can boast of. And, where it has not that effect, the most it can do is to make men become hypocrites, and profess a religion they do not believe; but scarce ever changes their hearts, or brings any to a sincere and efficacious assent to a faith which is thus violently forced on their minds.

About the same time, or not long after, Innocent wrote to the bishops of Spain; and the chief articles of his letter were: 1. That they ought to cut off from their communion such of their brethren as refused to communicate with Symphosius, Dictinius, and other bishops, who, having renounced the errors of Priscillian, had been re-admitted to the communion of the church by the council held at Toledo, in the year 400.<sup>2</sup> 2. That those bishops should be deposed who had been ordained without the knowledge or consent of their metropolitans. 3. That such as presumed to ordain against the canons should be likewise deposed, and all who had been thus ordained by them.

Chrysostom, the celebrated bishop of Constantinople, having been unjustly deposed in 403, and driven from his see by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and the council at Quercum, or at the Oak, near Chalcedon, had, upon his return to Constantinople, insisted upon a council being summoned, to make his innocence the more plainly appear to the world. This Theophilus, and the bishops of his party, not only strenuously opposed, but, by the great interest they had at court, prevailed upon the emperor Arcadius to drive him from Constantinople a second time, and banish him to Cucusus, an inhospitable place in Cilicia. The news of these last proceedings had not yet reached Rome, when Theophilus sent one of his lectors with a letter to

<sup>1</sup> Idem. *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 114.



Innocent's answer to Chrysostom's letter. Theophilus writes to Innocent. Innocent's answer to Theophilus. Letters from the bishops of Chrysostom's party to Innocent. Who sends letters of communion to them. Letters from Acacius to Innocent.

Innocent, acquainting him, that he had deposed Chrysostom. As, in this letter, Theophilus observed an entire silence with respect to the motives that had prompted him to take such a step, Innocent prudently forbore returning him an answer. There happened to be then at Rome a deacon of the church of Constantinople, who, hearing what Theophilus had written, went immediately, and warned Innocent to be upon his guard, entreating him, at the same time, not to proceed but with the utmost caution, in so nice and important an affair, and assuring him, that the truth could not remain long undiscovered. Accordingly, in three days, Pansovius, and three other bishops, arrived at Rome, with three letters for Innocent: namely, one from Chrysostom himself, another from the bishops of his communion, and the third from the whole clergy of Constantinople. Chrysostom, in his letter, which is still to be seen in his works, and in those of Palladius, who wrote the history of his persecution, after giving Innocent an account of the storm his enemies had raised against him, entreats him to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any share in them punishable, according to the ecclesiastical laws, and to continue to him the marks of his charity and communion. In the title and close of the letter, he addresses himself to one, but every where else to more persons, the letter having been written, as appears from the copy in Palladius,<sup>1</sup> not to Innocent alone, but to him, to Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia, bishops of the three chief sees in the west.

Innocent, acting with his usual prudence and circumspection, in his answers to the above-mentioned letters, declared, that he admitted the bishops of both parties to his communion, from which he could exclude no man till he was lawfully judged and condemned; and that therefore, to compose all differences, and leave no room for complaints on either side, it was fit a council should be assembled, consisting of the western as well as the eastern bishops. The other bishops of Italy, to whom Chrysostom had written, returned much the same answer,<sup>2</sup> following therein the advice, which Chrysostom himself had given to the bishops of his party: namely, that they should communicate with his enemies, to prevent divisions in the church, but not sign his condemnation, because he did not think himself guilty.<sup>3</sup> Innocent's answer to Theophilus was in words to the same effect. His letter to Chrysostom was carried into the east by Demetrius, bishop of Pessinus, who took care to show it every where, to the end it might be every where known, that the Roman church still communicated with that holy bishop.<sup>4</sup>

A few days after Innocent had answered

Chrysostom's letter, Petrus, one of Theophilus' presbyters, and Martyrius, deacon of the church of Constantinople, arrived at Rome, with letters from Theophilus, and the acts of Chrysostom's deposition by the council ad Quercum. From these it appeared, that the council had consisted of thirty-six bishops, whereof twenty-nine were Egyptians, and over these Theophilus had, as their metropolitan, too great an influence; that Chrysostom had been condemned without being heard, and that nothing had been laid to his charge deserving so severe and exemplary a punishment. Innocent, therefore, having read them, with the utmost indignation, answered Theophilus in a few words; that he was determined, as he had notified to him by his former letter, to communicate both with him and his brother John; that he could by no means depart from the communion of the latter, till he was lawfully judged and condemned; that a council was to be soon held, before which it was incumbent upon Theophilus to make good his charge, and the steps he had hitherto taken, by the canons and decrees of the council of Nice, since the Roman church admitted no others.<sup>1</sup> With this letter, Petrus and Martyrius returned to Constantinople, whence arrived at Rome, soon after their departure from that city, Theoctecnus, a presbyter of the church of Constantinople, and one of Chrysostom's friends, with letters from twenty-five bishops, informing Innocent that Chrysostom had been driven a second time from his see; that he had been conducted by a band of soldiers to Cucusus, and confined to that place; and that the great church had been consumed by fire, the very day he was carried out of Constantinople. Innocent was greatly affected with this account, and shed many tears in reading it. But as these troubles and disorders were fomented by some great men at the court either of Arcadius or Honorius, and a misunderstanding was then subsisting between the two brothers, or their ministers, he concluded that his endeavors towards the restoring of peace and unity would prove unsuccessful, and might even blow the fire, which already burned with so much violence, into a greater flame. On these considerations he wisely forbore making any application for the present to Honorius, and only sent letters of communion to Chrysostom, and the bishops, who had espoused his cause.<sup>2</sup> These letters were delivered to Theoctecnus, who was scarce gone, when one Paternus, who styled himself a presbyter of the church of Constantinople, arrived at Rome, with letters from Acacius, who had been intruded into the see of Constantinople, and from some other bishops of his party, charging Chrysostom with setting fire to the Basilic, or Great Church. So barefaced a calumny provoked

<sup>1</sup> Pall. Dial. c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Idem. ib. c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Idem. ib. c. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Pallad. ibid. c. 2.



Chrysostom's friends cruelly persecuted. Two edicts enacted against them. Several bishops, and the whole clergy of Constantinople, write to Innocent. His answer to the clergy. Innocent applies to Honorius; who writes to Arcadius.

Innocent to such a degree, that he would neither hear Paternus, nor return an answer to the letters he had brought.

In the meantime, a most cruel persecution was raised at Constantinople, against Chrysostom's friends, refusing to communicate with Acacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, who had intruded himself into the vacant see of Antioch, and, in defiance of the canons, maintained, by force of arms, the dignity he had usurped. This persecution was carried on under a Christian emperor, with as much cruelty as any had ever been under the most inveterate enemies of the Christian name. The pretence they made use of was to discover the authors of the late fire; and as the imperial officers chiefly suspected, or pretended to suspect, Chrysostom's friends, Optatus, who was then prefect or governor of Constantinople, and a pagan, laid hold of that opportunity to vent upon them the implacable hatred he bore to the religion they professed. Many, therefore, without distinction of sex or condition, were, by his orders, dragged to the public gaols, and confined there to dungeons; others tormented with such barbarity as to expire on the rack; and great numbers, after having undergone repeated tortures, stripped of all their effects, and banished to the most remote and desolate places of the empire.

At the same time the emperor Arcadius, strangely prepossessed against Chrysostom, and those of his communion, caused two edicts to be published; the one directed to the governors of the provinces, whom he strictly enjoined not to suffer, in their respective jurisdictions, any private assemblies or meetings of persons, who, despising the churches, worshipped elsewhere, lest they should seem to communicate with the most reverend prelates of the holy law, Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius. The other commanded such bishops as refused to communicate with them, to be driven from their sees, and their effects to be seized. The persecution, which still raged, though it was soon after stopped at the remonstrances of Studius, the præfectus prætorio, and the severity, with which the two imperial edicts were put in execution, drove great numbers, both of the clergy and laity, from Constantinople, and the provinces subject to Arcadius. Among the former were Cyriacus, bishop of Synnada, Eulysius of Apamea, in Bithynia, Palladius of Helenopolis, Germanus, a presbyter, and Cassianus, a deacon, who afterwards embraced the monastic life, and became famous for his ascetic writings. Eulysius brought letters to Innocent from fifteen bishops of Chrysostom's communion, acquainting him with the deplorable state of the Constantinopolitan church, and one from Anysius of Thessalonica, declaring, that in the present unhappy divisions he had resolved to conform entirely to the

sentiments of the Roman church. Germanus and Cassianus likewise delivered letters to Innocent, written in the name of the whole clergy of Constantinople, and giving him an account of the persecution that still raged, and of the cruel treatment their bishop had met with.<sup>1</sup> Innocent, in his answer to this letter, expresses, in the most pathetic terms, his concern for the unhappy state of that church, and their sufferings; he encourages them to bear, with patience, their present tribulation and afflictions, nay, and with joy, since it is for the sake of justice they suffer, and are thus persecuted: he complains of the undue deposition of his colleague, and installation of another in his lifetime, which he shows to be against the canons of the council of Nice, the only canons admitted and obeyed by the Roman church: he concludes with informing them, that as he had always thought it necessary, that an oecumenical council should assemble, he had long considered, and was still considering, by what means it might be assembled, since a council, and nothing else, could appease so violent a storm, and restore to the church the so much wished for tranquillity.<sup>2</sup>

Two presbyters in the mean time came to Rome from the east, Domitianus of Constantinople, and Vallagus, of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, and brought with them the original acts, which they had purchased with a large sum of the imperial officers, containing an authentic detail of the cruelties which some women of quality had been made to endure for not communicating with Arsacius, and the bishops of his faction. With these the good bishop was so deeply affected, that he could no longer forbear applying to Honorius, who, at his request, wrote immediately to Arcadius a very pressing and friendly letter in favor of Chrysostom, and those of his communion. At the same time he issued an order for convening a council of the western bishops, who, meeting soon after at Rome, drew up an address, which they sent to Ravenna, where the emperor then was, earnestly entreating him to interpose anew his good offices with his brother Arcadius, that an oecumenical council might be allowed to assemble at Thessalonica, in order to compose the present differences, which had already produced a misunderstanding between the eastern and western churches, and might in the end bring on an entire separation. Honorius, in compliance with their request, wrote a third letter to Arcadius (for he had, it seems, written already a second), and at the same time one to Innocent, desiring him to appoint five bishops, two presbyters of the Roman church, and one deacon, to carry his letter into the east, think-

<sup>1</sup> Pall. ubi supra. Soz. l. 8. c. 26. Hist. Lausiæ. c. 121.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. ubi supra, & ep. Rom. Pont. Inn. 15.



Honorius' letter. The pope's legates not allowed to touch at Thessalonica. The hard usage they met with on their journey, and at Constantinople. The letters taken from them by force. They are put on board a leaky vessel, but arrive safe in Italy.

ing that such a legation would add no small weight to his mediation. The letter to Arcadius was in the following terms:

"This is the third time I write to your meekness (*ad mansuetudinem tuam*) entreating you to correct and rectify the iniquitous proceedings that have been carried on against John, bishop of Constantinople. But nothing, I find, has been hitherto done in his behalf. Having therefore much at heart the peace of the church, which will be attended with that of our empire, I write to you anew by these holy bishops and presbyters, earnestly desiring you to command the eastern bishops to assemble at Thessalonica. The western bishops have sent five of their body, two presbyters of the Roman church, and one deacon, all men of the strictest equity, and quite free from the bias of favor and hatred. These I beg you would receive with that regard which is due to their rank and merit: if they find John to have been justly deposed, they may separate me from his communion; and you from the communion of the orientals, if it appears that he has been unjustly deposed. The western bishops have very plainly expressed their sentiments, in the many letters they have written to me on the subject of the present dispute. Of these I send you two, the one from the bishop of Rome, the other from the bishop of Aquileia; and with them the rest agree. One thing I must above all beg of your meekness; that you oblige Theophilus of Alexandria to assist at the council, how averse soever he may be to it; for he is said to be the first and chief author of the present calamities. Thus the synod, meeting with no delays or obstructions, will restore peace and tranquillity in our days."<sup>1</sup>

With these letters the legates set out from Rome, attended by the above-mentioned prelates, Demetrius, Cyriacus, Eulysius, and Palladius; and, sailing for Greece, put in at Athens, with a design to pursue their voyage to Thessalonica, having letters from Innocent to Anysius, bishop of that city. But at Athens they were, to their great surprise, stopped and detained by a military tribune, who let them know that they must not touch at Thessalonica; and at the same time appointed a centurion as a guard over them, strictly enjoining him not to suffer them, under any pretence whatsoever, to approach that city. Soon after, the tribune parted them, and putting them on board two vessels, ordered the mariners to convey them straight to Constantinople. Anysius communicated with Chrysostom, as I have observed above; and it was, without all doubt, on this consideration that the legates were not allowed to set foot in his diocese. They arrived at Constantinople the third day after they had left Athens, but starved with hunger; for the

tribune had neither supplied them with provisions when they embarked, nor allowed them time to supply themselves; so that they had tasted no kind of victuals during the three days they were at sea. On their arrival at Constantinople, they were not suffered to come ashore, but ordered to a castle on the Thracian coast called Athyra, where they were all closely confined, the legates in one common room, and the other bishops in so many separate cells. As the people of Constantinople were most zealously attached to Chrysostom, the emperor apprehended, and with a great deal of reason, that their entering the city, and conversing publicly there, might be attended with uncommon disturbances and commotions; and therefore thought it advisable to keep them at a distance, and under confinement. They had not been long thus confined, when they were ordered, they knew not by whom, to deliver the letters they had brought. But neither by this person, whoever he was, nor by several others, who were successively sent on the same errand, could they be prevailed upon to part with them, alleging, that letters from an emperor ought to be delivered to none but an emperor.

As they continued firm and unshaken in this resolution, one Valerian, a military tribune, was at last called in, and ordered to employ the rhetoric peculiar to his profession, since no other could prevail. Valerian accordingly, after a short preamble, proceeded to violence; and, seizing them, took the letters by force, having in the struggle wounded one of the bishops in the hand. The next day they were visited by a person, who, without acquainting them who he was, or by whom sent, offered them a very considerable sum, on condition they would communicate with Atticus, who, upon the death of Arsacius, had, by the bishops of his faction, been intruded in his room. Upon their rejecting, as they did, with the utmost indignation, this offer, Valerian, who was present, conducted them under a strong guard to the seaside, and there put them on board an old leaky vessel, having first, with a large bribe, prevailed upon the commander, as they were informed, to engage his word, that they should not outlive that voyage. They outlived it, however, and, having reached Lampsacus, they embarked on board another vessel, which landed them safe at Otranto. As for the eastern bishops who had attended them from Rome, namely, Cyriacus, Eulysius, Palladius, and Demetrius, after having been some time kept under close confinement at Athyra, they were banished to the most remote and abandoned places of the empire. The other bishops, who refused to communicate with Atticus, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, fared no better, being in like manner either driven into banishment, or obliged to abscond, and, under the

<sup>1</sup> Pall. *ibid.*



Honorius resolves to revenge the affront offered to his ambassadors, but is diverted from it. Arcadius and Eudoxia not excommunicated by Innocent. Chrysostom did not appeal to the see of Rome.

disguise of mechanics, earned their livelihood by the meanest professions. Many perished in the places of their exile for want of necessities; and others were so cruelly harassed, nay, and barbarously beaten by the merciless soldiery, appointed to conduct them, that they died on the road.<sup>1</sup> Such were the wretched effects of that unchristian principle of persecution being lawful to punish error in religious disputes, which all sects of Christians then held, and all suffered by in their turns, as the different parties among them got the civil magistrate and force on their side.

Honorius, being informed of the base treatment the legates had met with, though vested with the sacred character of ambassadors, was so provoked at such a notorious violation of the right of nations, that he resolved to make war on his brother, and revenge it by force of arms. But from this resolution he was diverted by a threatened invasion of the barbarians, and the seasonable discovery of the famous Stilicho's treachery, which obliged him to keep all his troops in Italy, or the adjoining provinces. As for Innocent, finding the mediation of Honorius, which he had procured, prove unsuccessful, and no other means left of affording the least relief to Chrysostom and the other persecuted bishops, he resolved to make known to the world his abhorrence of the evils, which it was not in his power to redress; and accordingly separated himself from the communion of Atticus, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, as the chief authors of the present calamities.<sup>2</sup>

Baronius, thinking it inconsistent with the dignity of his high pontiff thus tamely to bear with the insulting conduct of Arcadius, would fain persuade us, that, after he had tried in vain all other methods of bringing the emperor, and the empress Eudoxia, to a sense of their duty, he at last thought himself obliged to thunder against both the tremendous sentence of excommunication, cutting them off as rotten members from the body of the faithful committed to his care and direction. To prove this, he produces several letters from Innocent to Arcadius, and from Arcadius to Innocent, transcribed partly from Gennadius, Glycas, and Nicephorus, and partly from the Vatican manuscripts.<sup>3</sup> To enter into a critical examination of those pieces, would be wasting time, and tiring the reader to no purpose. I shall therefore content myself with three observations, each of them sufficient, in my opinion, to make the world reject them all as mere forgeries. In the first place, the silence of the historians, who wrote at that time, touching so remarkable and unprecedented an event as the excommunication of an emperor and an empress, is an unanswerable confutation of every proof that can be alleged to support the authenticity of the pretended letters.

For who can imagine, that the writers, who flourished then, and have transmitted to us most minute accounts of far less important transactions both civil and ecclesiastical, would have passed this over in silence? In the second place, Eudoxia is supposed, in all those letters, to have outlived Chrysostom; whereas it is certain, that she died in 404, four years before him. Lastly, in the above-mentioned letter, Arcadius is all along supposed to have repented, and changed his conduct towards Chrysostom, to have persecuted his enemies as he had formerly done his friends, and to have chiefly vented his resentment on the first author of all the disturbances, the empress, who thereupon, out of grief, rage, and despair, fell into a dangerous malady.<sup>1</sup> But of all this not the least hint is to be met with in Palladius, who wrote in the last days of the life and reign of Arcadius; nay, that historian speaks of the friends of Chrysostom as men still under the emperor's displeasure, and feeling the dreadful effects of it in the inhospitable places, to which they had been formerly confined.

From the conduct of Chrysostom on this occasion, the Roman catholic divines have taken a great deal of pains to prove, that the custom of appealing to the see of Rome obtained in his time; that he actually appealed to that see; and consequently, that the prerogative of receiving appeals from all parts, and finally deciding all controversies, claimed by the bishops of Rome, was then acknowledged even in the east. Nothing surely but the utmost distress for want of other instances to prove their assertion, could have tempted them to make use of this; since, from the conduct of Chrysostom on this very occasion, nay, and from that of Innocent too, if set in their true light, it may be undeniably made out, that this pretended prerogative was utterly unknown to both. The fact stands thus, and thus it is related by the historians, who have transmitted it to us: Chrysostom is unjustly accused; the bishop of Alexandria takes upon him to inquire into his conduct; assembles a council, consisting chiefly of Egyptian bishops, and summons Chrysostom to appear before them: Chrysostom pays no regard to the summons, protests against it, and will not allow the bishops assembled to have any power or authority over him, "since it had been ordained by the canons of the church, that the affairs of the provinces should be regulated by the bishops of the provinces; and it was consequently very incongruous, that the bishops of Thrace should be judged by those of Egypt."<sup>2</sup> No regard is had to his protest, none to the canons upon which it was grounded: he is summoned anew; and, not appearing within the limited time, is

<sup>1</sup> Pall. in dial. ubi supra.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ibidem.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ann. 407. n. 19—22.

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Bar. ubi sup. Niceph. l. 13. c. 34. & Glyc. l. 4. p. 259, 260.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysos. ep. 122.



Chrysostom an utter stranger to the power of receiving appeals in the bishops of Rome. Chrysostom never acknowledged such a power. The disingenuity of Bellarmine. Innocent's letter to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse.

judged, condemned, and deposed. From this sentence he appeals to a lawful council; but, being, notwithstanding his appeal, driven from his see, he recurs at last to the western bishops, namely, to Innocent of Rome, Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia, entreating them not to abandon him in his distress, nor exclude him from their communion,<sup>1</sup> but to procure by all means the assembling of a general council, in order to restore the church to her former tranquillity.

Such was the conduct of Chrysostom: and, from this conduct, does it not manifestly appear, that Chrysostom was an utter stranger to the pretended power in the bishops of Rome of receiving appeals from all other tribunals, and finally determining all controversies? Who can think, that, had he been acquainted with such a prerogative, he would, when so unjustly oppressed, have appealed to a council, which, he was well apprised, would meet with great obstructions, when he had, ready at hand, a more certain and easy method of finding relief? Had he been satisfied, that Innocent had such a privilege, is it likely he would have written to him on so urgent an occasion, without taking the least notice of it; that he would have contented himself with only entreating him to procure the assembling of a general council? Should a bishop now, apprehending himself injured by a national or provincial synod, appeal, not to the pope, but, as Chrysostom did, to a general council, he would, by such an appeal, draw upon himself the indignation of the Roman see; for it would be thence concluded, and no conclusion can be more natural, that he did not acknowledge the power of receiving appeals claimed by that see.

But Chrysostom, say they, did acknowledge such a power; for, in his letter to Innocent, he entreats him "to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, and to pronounce all, who had any share in them, punishable, according to the ecclesiastical laws." But Chrysostom addresses himself here, not to Innocent alone, as I have already observed, but to him, in conjunction with Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia;<sup>2</sup> nay, he addresses himself, throughout the whole letter, to more persons than one; and yet Baronius has the assurance to style the letter an "Appeal to Innocent."<sup>3</sup> And why to him, and not to the other two, since he wrote nothing to him but what he wrote to them? Bellarmine, finding some expressions in the above mentioned letter, which he thought might be so interpreted as to favor and countenance the pretensions of the see of Rome, had Chrysostom addressed himself to Innocent alone, makes him accordingly, by altering the number in the passage he quotes, address himself to Innocent alone;(\*) and then concludes,

that even the Greeks acknowledge the bishop of Rome for their supreme judge.<sup>1</sup> What must every impartial man think of a cause, that wants to be thus defended? What of those, who thus defend it?

About this time, that is, in the year 405, Innocent, being consulted by Exuperius, (\*) bishop of Toulouse, concerning some points of discipline, answered him by a decretal, containing the following decisions: 1. That the priests and deacons, who were daily employed in sacrificing or baptizing, were not to be allowed the use of matrimony; that those, who were ignorant of the decretal issued by Syricius, might be forgiven, upon their promising thenceforth to live continent; but, as to the rest, they should, as unworthy of indulgence, be deposed. The second article relates to those, who, after baptism, had led a wicked or sinful life, and at the point of death desired the communion. Innocent declares, that to such, according to the ancient discipline of the church, which was more severe, repentance was granted, and not the communion; but, according to the present practice, both were granted. By repentance is here meant, according to the most probable opinion, a reconciliation with the church; and, by the communion, the eucharist, which the thirteenth canon of the council of Nice commands to be given to all dying persons who desire it. Some doubted whether it was lawful for a Christian to discharge the office of a judge, in criminal cases. Innocent therefore declares, in the third article, that no penance ought to be imposed upon those who had condemned criminals to the rack, or even to death, the civil power having been established by God for the punishment of criminals. As women were, it seems, more frequently punished for adultery than men, some imagined that crime not to be alike punishable in both. This notion Innocent confutes in the fourth article; adding, that women were more frequently punished, merely because the husbands were more forward in accusing their wives, than wives in accusing their husbands. The fifth

<sup>1</sup> Bell. Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 15.

(\*) Exuperius was, as we gather from Ausonius, a native of Bourdeaux, one of the greatest orators of his time, and had governed Spain in quality of prefect. He afterwards withdrew from the world; embraced the ecclesiastical state in the place of his nativity; (a) and was, for his eminent virtues, raised to the see of Toulouse. He was chiefly commendable for his charity to the poor; though he bestowed the greater part of it on objects, perhaps, of all, the least worthy of his compassion: for, by the monk Sisennius, he sent considerable sums into the east, to be distributed there among the monks of Egypt and Palestine; (b) which might have been better employed at home, Gaul being then threatened with an invasion of the Vandals, Alans, and other barbarous nations; who, accordingly, broke into that province on the last day of the year 406, and made themselves masters of Toulouse itself. It was, however, this kindness of Exuperius to the monks, that chiefly recommended him to Jerom, (c) who often mentions him with the greatest commendations, (d) and even inscribed to him his comment on Zechariah.

(a) Paulin. ep. 20.

(b) Hier. præf. in lib. 1, 2,

(c) Idem ibid.

& 3. Zech. & ep. 152.

(d) Idem ep. 410, 411.

<sup>2</sup> Pall. dial. 2. <sup>3</sup> Idem ibid. <sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 404. n. 20.

(\*) He changes "obsecro ut scribatis" into "obsecro ut scribas."



His letter to Anysius of Thessalonica. Rome reduced to great straits by Alaric.

article is a confirmation of the third; for it only absolves from all sins such as are obliged, by their office, to prosecute or condemn criminals. The sixth article excludes from the communion of the church all men, who, after they have been parted from their wives, marry other women; and all women, who, after they have been parted from their husbands, marry other men. (\*) The same punishment is, by this article, inflicted on those who marry them, but not on their parents or relations, provided they have been no way accessory to that unlawful contract. The last article contains a catalogue of the canonical books of scripture, the same as are still acknowledged by the church of Rome as canonical. In the same article, some books are pointed out, that ought to be absolutely condemned and rejected.<sup>1</sup> (†) These directions, or instructions, Innocent pretends to have drawn partly

(\*) The matrimonial bond is held, by the church of Rome, indissoluble, and a separation only allowed as to bed and board, even in cases of adultery; whence it follows, that so long as they both live, neither can marry, without being guilty of adultery. There are, however, some "annulling impediments," as the canonists style them, that is, circumstances rendering the marriage contract null; and if any of these intervene, and is made to appear, the parties are then declared not to have been married; and, consequently, free to marry whom they please. Until Innocent's time, men who had been parted from their wives convicted of adultery, were allowed to marry again. This Epiphanius tells us in express terms; adding, that, agreeably to scripture, (no doubt to Matt. v. 32.) it could be no crime to marry again; that those who married again were not excluded, on that score, from life everlasting; and consequently ought not to be excluded from the communion of the church. (a) The scope and design of Epiphanius, throughout his work, was to acquaint us with the several heresies that sprang up in the church, and to explain, in opposition to them, the catholic doctrines. It must therefore have been deemed a heresy in his time, that is, towards the latter end of the fourth century, to think the matrimonial bond indissoluble, even in cases of adultery, or to hold it unlawful for a man to marry again, who had put away his wife for the cause of fornication. But the heresy became afterwards a catholic truth, and the catholic truth a heresy. This change, however, was not so much owing to Innocent's decretal, as to the two books which St. Austin wrote about the year 419, to prove that it is unlawful for a husband, who has put away his wife, even for adultery, or for a wife who has been thus put away, to marry again, while both are living. He founds his opinion on that of St. Paul, "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth." (b) But, instead of understanding that passage with the exception made by our Savior himself, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication," &c. he endeavors, by many logical distinctions, and unnatural interpretations, to remove that exception, though expressed by the Evangelist in the plainest terms. He was therein, no doubt, misled by the groundless, but then reigning, notion, of an extraordinary merit annexed to celibacy; and therefore ends his work with exhorting the husbands, who have put away their wives, to observe continency, in imitation of the ecclesiastics, who observe it, says he, with the greatest exactness, though it was not by their own choice that some of them went into orders. It may be questioned whether, even then, the continence of the unmarried clergy was such as he represents it.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1254—1256.

(†) These were several books, styled "The acts of the apostles," forged by Leucius, Nezocharis, and Leonides, and ascribed by them to some of the apostles. Leucius was, by sect, a Manichee, as appears from Austin, who confuted his books. (c) Nezocharis and Leonides are, by Innocent, styled philosophers. The

(a) Epiph. hæres. 59.

(b) 1 Corinth. vii. 39.

(c) Aug. de fide contra Manich.

from scripture, and partly from tradition; and thanks Exuperius, because he had, by applying to him for a solution to his difficulties, engaged him to examine them with attention, and thereby given him an opportunity of learning what he had not known before. It is surprising he should have mentioned the scripture, since the very first article, debarring for ever married men from the use of matrimony, is an open contradiction to the directions given by St. Paul to all married persons, without restraint or distinction; "Defraud you not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, &c. and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency."<sup>1</sup>

As the bishops of Rome had, ever since the time of Damasus, taken upon them to appoint the bishop of Thessalonica their vicar for East Illyricum, Innocent no sooner heard, that Rufus had been promoted to that see, vacant by the death of Anysius, than he let all the bishops of those parts know, by a circular letter, probably directed to Rufus himself, that he conferred on him the same dignity which his predecessors had conferred on the other bishops of Thessalonica. He wrote, at the same time, a private letter to Rufus, containing some instructions relating to the exercise of his vicarious power, and, with them, the names of the provinces which he was to govern, as his vicar and first primate; but without intrenching, adds Innocent, upon the rights and privileges of the primate or metropolitan of each province. In this letter he takes great care, that Rufus should not forget he is indebted for such a power to the see of Rome; for that he frequently repeats, as if he entertained some jealousy of Rufus, or apprehended that he might claim such a power, as bishop of Thessalonica, that city being, according to the civil division of the empire, on which the ecclesiastical was ingrafted, the metropolis of East Illyricum.<sup>2</sup>

The same year, 407, the emperor Honorius visited the city of Rome, and continued there till the month of May, of the year 408. On the 23d of the following August, Stilicho was killed; and Alaric, the Goth, entering Italy soon after his death, appeared before Rome, and laid close siege to that city in the latter end of the same year. As no provisions could be conveyed into the place, all the avenues being shut up, and well guarded, a famine soon ensued, and upon the famine a plague, which daily swept off great numbers of the inhabitants. In this extremity, such of the senators as still adhered to the pagan superstitions, promising themselves relief from the gods of their ancestors, resolved to implore

books of Leucius, in the latter end of the present century, were anew declared apocryphal by pope Gelasius: "The books," says he in one of his decretals, "composed by Leucius, a disciple of the devil, are all apocryphal." (a)

(a) Gelas. in decretal. de lib. Apocryph.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Corinth. vii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Holsten. Coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 49—51.



The pagan superstitions connived at by Innocent. Innocent leaves Rome, and repairs to the emperor at Ravenna. Innocent's letter to Marcianus, bishop of Naissus. His letter to Aurelius of Carthage. The letter of the bishops of Macedon to Innocent. Innocent's answer.

their protection, by solemn sacrifices offered up to them in the capitol, and other public places of the city. This resolution, says Zosimus,<sup>1</sup> they imparted to Innocent, then bishop of Rome, who, sacrificing his private opinion to the public welfare, agreed to it, on condition that the ceremony should be privately performed. Of these sacrifices, Sozomen, too, takes particular notice;<sup>2</sup> but makes no mention of Innocent, which has induced some to suspect the veracity of Zosimus, who was, as is well known, a sworn enemy to the Christian religion. But that those sacrifices were performed, is affirmed both by him and Sozomen; and it is not at all probable, that Pompeianus, who was then governor of Rome, and a Christian, would have suffered them, without the consent and approbation of Innocent. However that be, I see not why Baronius should be so provoked against Zosimus, for making Innocent thus connive at the superstitious worship of the gentiles, since his successors have always allowed, and do still allow, even in Rome itself, the free exercise of the Jewish worship.

Rome being reduced to the last extremity, deputies were, in the end, sent out to treat with Alaric, who, hearkening to their proposals, raised the siege, upon their paying to him five thousand pounds weight of gold, thirty thousand of silver, four thousand silk garments, three thousand skins of purple dye, and as many pounds of pepper. At the same time the Romans engaged to mediate a peace between him and Honorius: but the emperor refusing to comply with the terms that were proposed, though no ways unreasonable, the Roman senate sent two solemn deputations to Ravenna, where Honorius then resided, to lay before him the danger to which he exposed the empire, and persuade him to accept the conditions offered him both by them and by Alaric. As the first deputation proved unsuccessful, Innocent, thinking his presence might give some weight to the negotiations, left Rome, and, together with the deputies, repaired to Ravenna. Thus he escaped the mortification of seeing the city of Rome taken and plundered by the barbarians.<sup>3</sup> For, Honorius still rejecting the terms of peace, Alaric returned with his army before Rome; and, having made himself master of it on the 24th of August, of the year 410, treated the great metropolis of the empire no better, if Jerom may be credited, than the Greeks are said to have treated ancient Troy.<sup>4</sup>

While Innocent continued at Ravenna, he wrote to Marcianus, bishop of Naissus; a city in Mæsia, concerning the ecclesiastics of his diocese, who had been ordained by Bonosus, of whom we have spoken above.<sup>5</sup> In that letter, Innocent declares that Marcianus ought

to admit to his communion, and even restore to their churches, those ecclesiastics, who, having adhered to Bonosus during his condemnation, were willing to return, provided they had been ordained by him before his condemnation. One of these, by name Rusticus, to remove all doubt concerning the validity of his ordination, had caused himself to be reordained by a catholic bishop; and this reordination Innocent condemns, in the same letter, as highly criminal.<sup>1</sup>

In the year 412, Innocent wrote to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, whom he seems to have greatly honored and esteemed, concerning the day on which Easter was to be kept in the year 414. He acquaints Aurelius, that the 16th day of the moon of March would fall that year on the 22d of the month, and the 23d of the moon on the 29th of the month; and consequently that, in his opinion, Easter ought to be kept on the 22d of March. However, he desires Aurelius to discuss that point in the council of the African bishops, that was in a short time to be held at Carthage; and to let him know, whether they approved of such a regulation, or what they objected against it, that he might solemnly notify by his letters, according to custom, the day, on which Easter was to be celebrated.<sup>2</sup> Their thus notifying to the other bishops the day on which Easter was to be kept, was no argument of power; but it gave them an air of pre-eminence, which they dexterously improved into power.

In the year 414, Vitalis, archdeacon probably of Thessalonica, arrived at Rome, with letters for Innocent, from the bishops of Macedon, touching certain points of discipline, which, it seems, they had referred to him, and he had decided before. In this letter they represent to him, in the first place, that, according to the custom and practice of their churches, the marrying a widow was no bar or impediment to orders, or even to the episcopal dignity; and that to marry one wife before, and a second after, baptism, was not, with them, deemed bigamy. Then passing to those, who had been ordained by Bonosus, they declare it as their opinion, that nothing more could be required than the blessing of a lawful bishop to readmit them to the functions of their office. They conclude with begging leave to raise to the episcopal dignity one Photinus, who had been condemned by the predecessors of Innocent, and to depose a deacon, by name, Eustatius.<sup>3</sup>

This letter Innocent answered, almost in the style and language of a modern pope. He begins with expressing his surprise at the affront they offered to the apostolic see, by calling in doubt what he had already decided. He then answers, one by one, the heads of their letter, with all the authority of an un-

<sup>1</sup> Zos. l. 5. c. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. 9. c. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Zos. l. 5. p. 819, 820. Soz. l. 9. c. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. ep. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. sup. p. 263—266.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1271.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.

<sup>3</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1272—1276.



Innocent declares orders conferred by heretics to be null. Which opinion has been since declared heretical. Innocent owns the holy see to have been imposed upon. The misunderstanding between the eastern and western churches continues after the death of Chrysostom.

erring judge, though neither he, nor any of his predecessors, had ever yet claimed, or thought of claiming, such a prerogative. He absolutely condemns the practice of admitting to orders such as had married widows, because that was forbidden, says he, by Moses to the high priest of the Jews; which was tacitly declaring the Levitical laws to be still, in some degree, binding with respect to the Christian clergy. He adds, that if any such had been ordained, it was the general practice of all the churches, both in the east and west, to depose them.(\*). As for those who had married but one of their two wives after baptism, Innocent declares them equally incapable of being ordained as if they had married both.(†) As to the ecclesiastics ordained by Bonosus, Innocent not only excludes them from the ministry, but endeavors to prove in general, that orders, when conferred by heretics, are null, borrowing, for that purpose, of St. Cyprian, all the arguments which that father had made use of to prove a no less erroneous opinion; namely, the nullity of baptism, when conferred by heretics.(‡)

The opinion, which he endeavors to establish here, has been since condemned as heretical, by several of his successors, and is now held as such by the whole church; which has cut out a great deal of work for the champions of infallibility. They plainly see, (and who can read Innocent's letter without seeing?) that the reasons which he made use of were all calculated to prove the nullity of ordination by the hands of a heretic; but nevertheless pretend, that whatever their seeming purport may be, Innocent employed them only to prove, that an heretical bishop had not the power of conferring grace, and with it the right of exercising lawfully the functions of his office.<sup>1</sup> But who can believe any man, endowed with the least share of common sense, capable of arguing so absurdly? If his meaning may be thus wrested, in spite of his words, to a catholic sense, whose meaning may not?

(\*) Such a practice, however general, could have no other foundation but the same unwarrantable notion: I say unwarrantable; for what can be more so than to exclude, as Innocent does, even from the lowest degrees in the church, a man who had married a widow, because the high priest of the Jews was not allowed to marry one, though all other priests were, under that law, free from such a restraint?

(†) Jerom held the contrary opinion, and maintained it in one of his letters, (a) with reasons, that appeared to Baronius "almost unanswerable," (b) that is, no otherwise answerable than by the "ipse dixit" of Innocent, which, with him, stood in the room of reason.

(‡) He was, it seems, no logician; else, to prove his opinion, he had never made use of arguments, that equally proved, and had been calculated to prove, an erroneous opinion, an opinion long before condemned by all the bishops of the catholic church, and very lately by himself, in a letter to Alexander, bishop of Antioch, where he maintains the validity of baptism conferred by an Arian. (c)

(a) Hier. ep. 83.

(b) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 60.

(c) Inn. ep. 18.

<sup>1</sup> Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 10.

With respect to Photinus, Innocent declares himself very unwilling to blame, or give occasion to the world to think that he blamed, the conduct of his predecessors, who had condemned Photinus; but nevertheless, since so many prelates had made it appear by their joint testimonies, that the holy see had been imposed upon by false and groundless reports, he agrees to his promotion. As to the deacon Eustatius, he lets them know, that, whatever reports may have been spread to his prejudice, he is well assured both of his probity, and the purity of his faith, and therefore cannot consent to his deposition. In the end of his letter, he complains of the bishops of Macedon for not paying due regard to the testimony of the Roman church, in behalf of the two subdeacons Dizonianus and Cyriacus.

We have observed above, that Chrysostom being driven from the see of Constantinople into exile, Innocent, and with him most of the western bishops, had espoused his cause with great warmth; but, finding that all their endeavors in his behalf proved unsuccessful, they at last parted themselves from the communion of Atticus of Constantinople, Porphyrius of Antioch, and Theophilus of Alexandria. In the year 407, Chrysostom died at Cumana in Pontus; but with him did not die the animosities, which his deposition had occasioned between the churches of the east and the west. Atticus indeed thought nothing could now obstruct the wished for union; and therefore, as soon as Chrysostom's death was known, he applied to Rome, desiring the communion of that church. But he was greatly surprised, when he understood, that Innocent, instead of readily granting him his request, insisted upon his first acknowledging Chrysostom to have been, and to have died, lawful bishop of Constantinople, by enrolling his name in the dyptichs, (\*) with the names of other bishops of that city. This demand seemed to Atticus highly unreasonable; for it was obliging him to acknowledge his own election to have been null. He therefore peremptorily refused to comply with it; but nevertheless continued soliciting, by means of his friends at Rome, a reconciliation with that church.<sup>1</sup> But Innocent was inflexible; he was determined at all events to carry his point, and therefore would hearken to no other terms till that was complied with. The eastern bishops followed the example of Atticus; the western that of Innocent. And thus were the separation, and the animosities attending it, continued seven years longer, each party bitterly inveighing, in the mean time, against the

(\*) The dyptichs were tables, in which were enrolled the names of all those who died in the communion of the church. The bishops were placed there by themselves; and of all commemoration was made by the deacon in time of the service.

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret. l. 5. c. 34.



The churches of Antioch and Rome reconciled. The bishop of Antioch strives to reconcile the churches of Rome and Constantinople. His imprudent conduct. The name of Chrysostom enrolled in the diptychs by the bishop of Constantinople. The two churches reunited at last. Innocent's letter to Alexander of Antioch. The prerogatives of the see of Rome owing to the city, and not to St. Peter.

authors of the divisions, and each expressing a most earnest desire of a reconciliation.

At length Porphyrius of Antioch, one of Chrysostom's most inveterate enemies, dying in the year 413, or 414, Alexander, who until then had led a monastic life, was chosen in his room by the unanimous consent of the people and clergy. As he was fully convinced of Chrysostom's innocence, and the malice of his enemies, he no sooner found himself vested with that dignity, than he caused the deceased prelate's name to be inserted in the diptychs of his church, and the two bishops Helpidius and Pappus to be restored to their sees, from which they had been driven for refusing to renounce his communion, and to communicate with his enemies. After this Alexander sent a solemn deputation to Rome, at the head of which was, it seems, the famous Cassian, to acquaint Innocent with his promotion, to inform him of what he had done, and thereupon to renew the union between the two churches. Alexander, who entertained a sincere desire of seeing peace and concord restored between the east and the west, did not doubt but the example of his church would be followed by many others, and a way, by that means, be paved to a general pacification. Innocent received the deputation with the greatest marks of joy, admitted Alexander to his communion, and, with the consent and approbation of twenty-four other bishops, declared the church of Antioch again united to that of Rome.

Several other bishops, moved partly by the example, and partly by the letters and exhortations of the bishop of Antioch, yielded to Innocent, and submitted to the terms he required. But Atticus still adhered to his former resolution, and, to gain him, Alexander, who spared no pains to complete the work he had begun, repaired in person to Constantinople. But he acted there with such indiscretion as rendered that haughty prelate more averse, than he had ever yet been, to an accommodation on the terms proposed by Innocent. For all other means he could think of, to compass his design, proving unsuccessful, he resolved in the end to apply to the populace, who, as he well knew, had been most zealously attached to Chrysostom during his life, and revered him as a saint after his death. Suffering therefore his zeal to get the better of his prudence, and of every consideration prudence could suggest, he began to harangue the multitude, and inflame them with seditious speeches against Atticus, as carrying, even beyond the grave, his hatred and malice against their holy bishop. The populace heard him with attention, applauded his zeal, and, full of rage against Atticus, demanded, in a tumultuous manner, that the name of so holy, so great and deserving a

prelate, might be enrolled, without further delay, in the diptychs. But their clamors and threats made no more impression on the mind of Atticus than the reasons of Alexander; he withstood both, and the bishop of Antioch, finding all his attempts thus shamefully baffled, returned to his see, with the mortification of having only widened the breach, which he intended to close, between the churches of Rome and Constantinople.<sup>1</sup> Baronius supposes Alexander to have acted on this occasion as Innocent's legate.<sup>2</sup> But I find nothing in the ancients to countenance such a supposition, besides his haughty behavior, and his pursuing, by the most unwarrantable methods, what he had in view.

Atticus, however, allowed in the end Chrysostom's name to be inserted in the diptychs; but whether he did it by choice or compulsion, is uncertain; for, in one of his letters, he writes, that he could no longer withstand the threats and violence of the enraged multitude;<sup>3</sup> and in another, that he had done it to comply with the will of the emperors, and to conform to the sentiments of his brethren, both in the east and west.<sup>4</sup> However that be, it is certain, that he never changed his sentiments with respect to Chrysostom, as is manifest from his declaring, after he had placed his name in the diptychs, that he thereby meant no more than to own, that he had been once bishop of Constantinople; but that he still adhered to the judgment that was given against him. With this, however, Innocent was satisfied; and so is Baronius.

Alexander maintained ever after a close correspondence with Innocent, courting his favor with the most servile submissions, recurring to him in every momentous affair relating to his church, and suffering himself to be blindly guided by his counsels. In one of his letters he consulted him, it seems, concerning the prerogatives of his see, and the extent of his jurisdiction; and nothing can be more subtle than Innocent's answer. For after a long preamble on the dignity of the see of Antioch, he craftily insinuates all the privileges and prerogatives annexed to it to be owing not to the dignity of the city, but to the dignity of the see, as having been once the see of St. Peter. He adds, that on this consideration it had been distinguished with an extensive jurisdiction, and that it yielded to that of Rome itself only because St. Peter had accomplished there what he had begun at Antioch.<sup>5</sup> What Innocent proposed to himself by thus exalting the see of Antioch, by deriving the privileges, prerogatives, and jurisdiction, of that see from St. Peter, is obvious. If they were owing not to the city, but to St. Peter, as Innocent affirms, those enjoyed by the see

<sup>1</sup> Niceph. l. 14. c. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 48. n. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Niceph. c. 26.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, c. 27.

<sup>5</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.



The division of the church founded on the division of the empire. Innocent encourages the bishop of Antioch to invade the rights of the metropolitans. Innocent's letter occasions great disputes between the bishops of Antioch and those of Cyprus.

of Rome were, in like manner, owing to St. Peter, and not to the city. This notion, now first started by Innocent, was not suffered to drop; but, being greedily embraced by his successors, it was, in process of time, improved by them into a general plea for all their exorbitant claims. And thus Innocent may be justly said to have pointed out the ground on which the unwieldy fabric of the papal power was afterwards built. But if it be true, as Innocent pretends, that the see of Antioch owed its dignity to St. Peter, and not to the city, how will he account for its being ranked under that of Alexandria, which was neither founded, nor had ever been honored, by that apostle? But not to waste time in combating such a groundless notion, nothing is more certain, than that the disposition and division of the church was founded upon, and entirely agreeable to, the disposition and division of the empire;<sup>1</sup> and consequently that as no regard was had to St. Peter, or any other apostle, in the civil, none could be had in the ecclesiastical, polity. And hence it naturally follows, that as Rome was the first city of the empire, Alexandria the second, and Antioch the third, the sees should be ranked in the same order; and in the same order they were ranked accordingly, though the see of Alexandria was founded only by a disciple of St. Peter, and that of Antioch was supposed to have been founded by St. Peter himself.

This division of the church took place soon after the division of the empire made by Constantine the Great, on which it was founded. It was first introduced by custom, but afterwards confirmed by several councils; and in none of them is there a word of St. Peter. As therefore the bishop of Alexandria preceded in rank the bishop of Antioch, for no other reason but because the city of Alexandria preceded in dignity the city of Antioch, according to the secular constitutions of the empire; so the bishop of Rome preceded in rank all other bishops, for no other reason but because the city of Rome, as the seat of the empire, preceded in dignity all other cities.

But to return to Innocent: In the same letter to Alexander he observes, that the bishop of Antioch did not preside over a single province, but a whole diocess; and therefore advises him not only to maintain the right he had of ordaining the metropolitans, but not to suffer other bishops in the provinces under his jurisdiction, however distant, to be ordained without his consent and approbation. He adds, that, with respect to the bishops of the less remote provinces, he might reserve to himself the right of ordaining them.<sup>2</sup> This was encouraging the bishop of Antioch to invade and usurp the undoubted rights of the metropolitans, in open defiance of the fourth and sixth canons of the council of Nice, which

were afterwards confirmed by almost innumerable other councils, all granting to the metropolitans the power of ordaining the bishops of their respective provinces jointly with the bishops of the same province, without ever once mentioning the patriarch or head of the diocess.<sup>1</sup> But of this right the bishops of Rome had deprived the metropolitans under their jurisdiction as early at least as the time of Symmachus; for that pope, in the letter which he wrote to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, appointing him his vicar for East Illyricum, charges him not to suffer any bishops to be ordained in those provinces without his consent and approbation. Innocent maintained what his predecessors had usurped; and, to countenance their usurpation and his own, he encourages, by this letter, the bishop of Antioch to pursue the same conduct with respect to the metropolitans of his diocess. The example of the bishops of Rome was, in process of time, followed by those of Constantinople, who, rivalling them in pride and ambition, not only usurped the power of ordaining all the bishops of their diocess, but, by the interest they had at court, obtained an imperial rescript, confirming to them the power which they had usurped. But they were soon obliged to part with it, though thus guaranteed, by the fathers of the council of Chalcedon empowering, by their twenty-eighth canon, the bishops of Constantinople to ordain the metropolitans in the diocesses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace; but at the same time ascertaining to the metropolitans the right of ordaining the bishops of their respective provinces. But the bishops of Rome, ever determined to part with no power, however acquired, found means not only to elude the decrees of this and several other councils, ascertaining the rights of the metropolitans in the plainest terms, but to improve, by daily encroachments, their usurped jurisdiction, as I shall have frequent occasion to observe in the sequel of this history.

Innocent complains, in the next article of his letter, of a custom that obtained in the island of Cyprus. It was one of the chief privileges of the patriarch, or bishop, who presided over a whole diocess, to ordain the metropolitans of the provinces comprised under his diocess. But the metropolitan of Cyprus was ordained by the bishops of that island without the consent, or even the privity, of the bishop of Antioch, though Cyprus belonged to his province, according to the civil division of the empire. This custom Innocent condemns, as repugnant to the canons of the council of Nice; adding, that it was first introduced in the unhappy times when Arianism prevailed all over Syria, the bishops of Cyprus refusing then to acknowledge those of Antioch, who were infected with that heresy. This ar-

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 105. & seq. <sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1269.

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Ell. Du Pin de antiq. eccles. disciplin. dissert. prim. n. 12.



Which are in the end decided in favor of the latter. Alterations in the state generally attended with the like alterations in the church. Ecclesiastics ordained by heretics to be admitted into the church only as laymen. Innocent's letter to the bishop of Eugubium. All churches ought, according to him, to conform to the customs of the Roman church.

ticle proved the source of endless disputes between the bishops of Antioch and those of Cyprus; the former pretending, that the power of ordaining the metropolitan of Cyprus was lodged in them, and the latter opposing with great warmth such a pretension. The controversy was at length referred to the council of Ephesus; and the fathers of that numerous assembly, having heard and examined with great attention the pleas of both parties, condemned in the strongest terms the pretension of the bishops of Antioch, as repugnant to the ancient canons, that is, to those very canons, on which, at the suggestion of Innocent, they had founded it. And here I cannot help observing, by the way, that the bishops of Antioch never thought of alleging, in support of their claim, the authority of Innocent, which they would certainly have done, had they not been well apprised, that no regard would have been paid to it by the fathers of the council. As for what Innocent adds concerning the time and manner in which the custom he complains of was introduced, he must certainly have been no less mistaken in those particulars, than he was in the sense and meaning of the canons of Nice. For who can imagine, that the Arian bishops at the time Arianism prevailed, that is, when they had the greatest interest at court, and the orthodox had none, would have suffered the bishops of Cyprus to withdraw themselves, contrary to the established laws of the church, from their jurisdiction, for no other reason, but because the bishops of Antioch professed the doctrine of Arius?

Alexander, in his letter to Innocent, had asked him, whether two metropolitan sees should be erected in one province, which had been divided by the emperors into two? Innocent replies, that the concerns of the church being different from those of the state, the church ought to adhere to the ancient rule. However, it is plain from history, that such alterations in the state were, generally speaking, attended with the like alterations in the church; insomuch that when the bishop of any considerable city wanted to be raised to the dignity of a metropolitan, the most expeditious way of gratifying his ambition was, to apply to the emperor for a division of the province; that his city being advanced by such a division, to the rank of a metropolis, he might, by the same means, be preferred to that of a metropolitan. Of mere bishops, thus raised to the dignity of metropolitans, without any regard to Innocent's letter, or, as it is styled, decretal, several instances occur in history.

Innocent, in the end of his letter, declares it as his opinion, that such ecclesiastics as had renounced Arianism, or any other heresy, with a desire of being received into the church, ought not to be admitted as ecclesiastics, but only as laymen. This doctrine is entirely

agreeable to the erroneous doctrine concerning the invalidity of ordination by the hands of a heretic, which we have heard him labor to establish in his letter to the bishops of Macedon.<sup>1</sup> He concludes this letter with entreating the bishop of Antioch to cause it to be read in a council, or to see that copies of it be transmitted to all the bishops of his diocese, that all may agree in observing the instructions which it contains.<sup>2</sup>

But of all Innocent's letters, that which he wrote to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, (a city still known by the same name in the duchy of Urbino), is by far the most worthy of notice, whether we consider the doctrine which he there lays down, or the principles on which he founds it. As to the doctrine, it may be reduced to the two following heads: namely, That all the churches in the west are bound to adopt, and strictly to observe, every practice and custom observed by the Roman church; and that the customs of all other churches differing from those of the Roman church, are but corruptions of the ancient tradition, deviations from the practice of the primitive times, and insufferable abuses. As for the principles on which he founds this doctrine, they are, to say no more, of a piece with the doctrine itself. For he pretends, 1. That no apostle, besides St. Peter, ever preached in the west. He ought, with St. Peter, to have at least excepted St. Paul; and, no doubt, would, had not his memory failed him, as well as his infallibility. He supposes, in the second place, that all the churches in the west were founded by St. Peter, or by some of his successors; and consequently, that they ought to conform to the customs of the Roman church, since to that church they owe their origin. But that the church of Lyons, not to mention others, was founded by preachers sent thither out of Asia by St. Polycarp, and not by St. Peter, or any of his successors, is affirmed by all the ancients, and allowed by the most learned among the moderns; though some of them pretend, without the least foundation, the whole to have been done by the authority of the bishop of Rome.<sup>3</sup> Innocent pretends, in the third place, every point of discipline and ecclesiastical polity to have been settled by the apostles, and whatever was settled at Rome by St. Peter to have been there strictly observed ever since his time, without the least addition or diminution. He concludes this part of his letter with laying it down as a general maxim, that it is unlawful for any bishop to make the least alterations in the discipline of his church, or even to introduce into one church a custom or practice observed by another.<sup>4</sup> This nevertheless is what all

<sup>1</sup> Vide supra, p. 141.    <sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1265—1269.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Petr. de Marc. dissert. de primat. p. 227.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. t. 1. p. 1245. Ugh. t. 1. p. 676.



Some customs of the Roman church borrowed of other churches. The ceremony of anointing those who are confirmed. Confirmation not a sacrament. Why deemed formerly unlawful to fast on Sunday or Saturday.

bishops have done, and even those of Rome, both before and after Innocent's time, and consequently what they thought it lawful to do. The psalmody, for instance, (and innumerable other instances might be alleged), or the singing of psalms in the churches, was not instituted by any of the apostles, but first introduced by St. Ignatius into the church of Antioch,<sup>1</sup> whence it spread in a very short time to all the churches in the east, those bishops no more scrupling to adopt, than Ignatius had scrupled to introduce, so laudable a practice. Of the eastern churches it was borrowed by the church of Milan, and of the church of Milan by that of Rome, long before Innocent's time; which plainly shows, that his predecessors held not that doctrine, no more than one of the best of his successors, St. Gregory the Great, who openly approves of some customs, that were first unknown to, but afterwards adopted by his church.<sup>2</sup> Upon the whole, it is evident, that Innocent was grossly mistaken, not only with respect to this point, but likewise in asserting, that whatever had been settled at Rome by St. Peter, was still observed there without the least addition or diminution.

The remaining part of Innocent's letter relates to some particular ceremonies and customs, especially to the ceremony of confirming those who were baptized, and the custom of fasting on Saturdays. With respect to the former, he informs Decentius, that according to the customs of the church, founded on the practice of the apostles, the bishop alone can anoint on the forehead those who have been baptized, and give them the Holy Ghost; and that the priests can only anoint other parts, the episcopal power not having been granted to them, though they partake of the priesthood. (\*)

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. l. 6. c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. l. 7. ep. 64.

(\*) The ceremony of anointing with oil the forehead, and likewise the organs of the five senses, in those who had been baptized, is undoubtedly very ancient. Tertullian, who lived in the latter end of the second century, speaks of it as a ceremony universally practised and established. (a) St. Cyprian, (b) who flourished fifty years after St. Ambrose, (c) St. Austin, (d) St. Jerom, (e) and the other fathers, describe it as a ceremony by which the Holy Ghost was given to those who had been baptized, and consequently which none but bishops could administer, they being the successors of the apostles, to whom alone that power was granted. For the fathers, generally speaking, and other ancient writers, suppose this, and the imposition of hands, by which the Holy Ghost was given by the apostles to those who were baptized, (f) to be one and the same ceremony. The oil employed on this occasion was, as early as the third century, solemnly consecrated, kept in the churches or places where the faithful met, and held by them in great veneration. (g) This gave rise, in the following century, to many superstitious practices, and miracles were said to have been wrought by the "holy oil," to warrant such practices, and confound those who thought it unlawful to comply with them. A very remarkable miracle of this

(a) Tert. de resur. carnis. (b) Cypr. ep. 72, 73.  
(c) Ambr. de sacram. l. 3. (d) Aug. contra Petal. l. 1. c. 2.  
(e) Hier. contra Luciferian. l. 3. c. 16. In ep. 1.  
(f) Act. 8: 15—17. Joan. tract. 3. & de  
(g) Cyp. ep. 70. & de oper. card. & unct. Chris. diver. ser. 33.

The Roman catholics, finding this ceremony, now known by the name of confirmation, styled a sacrament by St. Cyprian,<sup>1</sup> and St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> have thereupon raised it to that rank, not reflecting that the ancient writers frequently make use of that word to express no more than a sacred ceremony, or mystery. And truly were they to reckon among their sacraments all the ceremonies which the fathers and other Christian writers have distinguished with that title, their number would amount to seventy rather than to seven.

With respect to the other point, those who are ever so little versed in the writings of the fathers, must know, that from the earliest times it was deemed unlawful, nay, and highly criminal, for a Christian to fast on Sunday or Saturday; on Sunday, because those heretics, who denied the resurrection of our Savior, fasted on that day, in opposition to the orthodox, who, believing it, solemnized the Sunday, the day on which it happened, with feasting and rejoicings; on Saturday, because other heretics holding the god of the Jews, and the author of their law, to be an evil spirit, whom Christ came to destroy, fasted on the seventh day, thinking that by fasting they vilified the god of the Jews as much as the Jews honored him by feasting.<sup>3</sup> Among the ancient canons, known by the name of the "Apostolic Constitutions," we read the following ordinance: "If a clerk shall be found to have fasted on a Sunday or a Saturday, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be cut off from the communion of the faithful."<sup>4</sup> But that canon must be understood only with respect to the east; for there was broached, and there chiefly prevailed, the heresy that first introduced such a practice. But in the west,

nature is gravely related by Optatus Milevitanus, (a) who wrote about the middle of the fourth century. But, in the time of the apostles, the whole of the ceremony consisted in the imposition of hands: "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Not a word of oil, of chrism, of unction, of signing with oil on the forehead in the form of a cross, and much less of a blow given by the bishop on the cheek to the person that is confirmed, though these are now all deemed, in the church of Rome, material parts of this ceremony. As such rites were unknown to, and unpractised by, the apostles, it matters little how early they were introduced after their time. And here I cannot help observing, that the Roman catholics themselves have not thought fit to adopt all the ceremonies used on this occasion, and recommended by the fathers. For, in Innocent's time, the person confirmed was not only anointed on the forehead, but on other parts; on the forehead by the bishop, on other parts by the priests. The other parts were, as we gather from Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, (b) the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and feet. The anointing of these parts was, in the opinion of that father, no less fraught with mysteries than the anointing of the forehead; and yet the former unction, notwithstanding its antiquity, and all the mysteries it symbolized, has been long since omitted, as altogether unnecessary. They might in like manner have omitted all the rest, and contented themselves, as the apostles did, with the bare imposition of hands.

(a) Optat. Milev. contra Parm. l. 2. (b) Cyril. Catech. mystag. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ep. 72.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de diver. serm. 33.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Iren. l. 1. c. 21—<sup>4</sup> Apost. const. can. 55.  
24. & Epiph. hæres. 21  
—28. & 41, 42.



Friday from the earliest times a fast-day. Saturday a fast-day in the Roman church. The ceremony of anointing the sick with oil. Letters from the councils of Carthage and Milevum to Innocent. Innocent's answer to the councils.

where that heresy was scarce known, some churches, and the Roman in particular, observed both Fridays and Saturdays as fast-days. The Friday was, from the earliest times, a fast-day with all churches, both in the east and the west; the Saturday was only in the west, and even there with very few churches, which had borrowed that custom of the Roman church, as we are informed by St. Austin.<sup>1</sup> Innocent therefore, desirous of establishing in all other churches the custom that obtained in his own, undertakes to prove, first, that all may, and, secondly, that all ought to observe Saturday as a fast. That all may, he proves well enough; but the reasons he offers to show that they all ought, namely, "Because Christ lay in the sepulchre the Saturday as well as the Friday, and the apostles fasted, (as he supposes,) on both days," are manifestly inconclusive as to any obligation. Besides, it was not because Christ lay in the sepulchre, or because the apostles fasted, but because Christ was crucified on a Friday, that a fast was appointed to be observed on that day. In process of time, the custom of sanctifying both days with a fast took place in most of the western churches; and this custom has been made in latter times a general law, and one of the commandments of the church, which all Roman catholics are bound to obey on pain of damnation. However, the severity of it is so far relaxed, that, as they are only required to abstain from meat, the utmost riot and epicurism in other kinds of food, and in wine, may be, and are indulged on their fast-days.

The last article of Innocent's letter relates to the ceremony of anointing the sick with oil, agreeably to that of St. James, "Is any one sick among you," &c.<sup>2</sup> As the apostle directs the faithful to "call for the elders of the church;" some took from thence occasion to question whether bishops were empowered to perform that ceremony. Innocent therefore answers Decentius, who had proposed the question, that there can be no room to doubt whether or not the bishops have such a power, since the priests can have none, which the bishops have not, of whom they receive all their power. It is true, says Innocent, that St. James ordered the faithful to call for the elders, and not for the bishops; but that was because he knew that the bishops could not have so much leisure from other important duties as the priests. He adds, that this unction must not be applied to penitents; that the oil used in it must be blessed by the bishop; and when it is thus blessed, not the presbyters only, but all the faithful, may anoint with it, both themselves and others. The power of anointing, St. James confined to the elders or priests, and that is the present doctrine of the church of Rome, though Inno-

cent extended such a power to all the faithful. This ceremony, now known by the name of extreme unction, was, in Innocent's time, a kind of sacrament; for so he styles it.<sup>1</sup> But it is now a true sacrament, and such it was declared by the council of Trent.<sup>2</sup>

In the year 416, Innocent received three letters from the African bishops; namely, one from the bishops of Africa, properly so called, assembled at Carthage; another from those of Numidia, assembled at Milevum; and a third from St. Austin, signed by him and four other bishops. The two councils wrote to acquaint Innocent, that they had condemned Pelagius and his disciple Cælestius, of whose opinions I shall speak hereafter, and desired him to add the authority of the apostolic see to their decrees. The letter from St. Austin, and the four other bishops, was to inform Innocent, in a friendly manner, that he was suspected of countenancing those heretics, and favoring their doctrine. This suspicion they themselves seem not to have thought quite groundless: for Possidius, one of the bishops who subscribed the letter, writes, that the African bishops took a great deal of pains to convince Innocent, and his successor Zosimus, that the doctrine of Pelagius was erroneous and heretical, knowing that his followers were striving to infect the apostolic see itself with their poisonous tenets.<sup>3</sup> They strove in vain, says Baronius; and perhaps they did; but the African bishops had never taken so much pains to guard the apostolic see against that infection, had they not thought it capable of being infected. The five bishops sent to Innocent, together with their letter, St. Austin's answer to a letter which he had received from Pelagius, his confutation of a book composed by that heretic, and the book itself, with the passages marked in it which gave most offence, and claimed a particular attention, lest he should overlook them.<sup>4</sup> This was not treating him as an infallible judge. (\*)

The letters from the council of Carthage, from that of Milevum, and from the five bishops, were brought to Rome by Julius, bishop of some city in Africa; and, by the same Julius, Innocent answered them with three letters, all dated the 27th of January, of the year 417. The first, which is addressed to Aure-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1248. <sup>2</sup> Concil. Trid. sess. 14. can. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Possid. Aug. vit. c. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. ep. 95.

(\*) Baronius observes here, that their informing him by a private letter, and not by a public one from the council, of the suspicions that some entertained of him, was a mark of the great respect and veneration they had for the bishop of Rome, whose nakedness they were unwilling, as it became dutiful children, to expose to the eyes of the world. (a) And who told Baronius, that, in the like circumstances, they would not have shown the same respect for any other bishop? He had better have observed, and the observation is more obvious, that his being suspected at all evidently proves the infallibility of the apostolic see not to have been, in those days, an article of the catholic faith.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 416. n. 11.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. ep. 86.

<sup>2</sup> James v. 14, 15.



He claims the first a divine right of finally deciding all controversies. Which is not acknowledged by the African nor the Numidian bishops. An instance of Innocent's great subtlety and address. He excommunicates Cælestius and Pelagius.

lius, probably bishop of Carthage, and to the other bishops of that assembly, he begins with commending them for their zeal, their pastoral vigilance, and the regard they had shown for the apostolic see. He thence takes an opportunity to resume his usual and favorite subject, the dignity, pre-eminence, and authority of that see; roundly asserting, that "all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by Divine right, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces." This was indeed a very bold claim, and a direct asserting to himself the universal supremacy attained by his successors. But it was yet too early for such a claim to be granted; and it is plain the African bishops had no idea of this Divine right. For, had they entertained any such notion, they surely would never have presumed finally to condemn and anathematize, as they did, Pelagius and Cælestius, without consulting at least the apostolic see: neither would they have written to Innocent in the style they did, after they had condemned them: for, in their letter, they did not leave him at liberty to approve or disapprove of what they had done; but only desire him to join his authority to theirs, which they well knew he could not refuse to do, without confirming the suspicion of his countenancing the Pelagians, and their doctrine. "We have anathematized Pelagius and Cælestius," say the fathers of the council of Carthage, "and thought fit to acquaint you with it, that to the decrees of our mediocrity might be added the authority of the apostolic see." This is a modest style, and respectful to the see of Rome; but it is that of men who plainly thought they had a right to act in this matter, by their own judgment and power, without waiting for the award of that see, as they ought to have done, if they had allowed of Innocent's claim. In like manner, the council of Milevum, after informing Innocent of the sentence, which they had pronounced against the two above-mentioned heretics, adds; "And this error and impiety, which has every where so many followers and abettors, ought also to be anathematized and condemned by the apostolic see;"<sup>1</sup> which was putting Innocent in mind of what he ought to do, and not consulting him what they should do. This conduct of the African bishops gave Innocent no small uneasiness. He was at a loss what to do at so critical a juncture. For to approve of a conduct, so derogatory to the pretended dignity of his see, was giving up his claim to the Divine right of finally deciding all ecclesiastical controversies. To disapprove it, was confirming the suspicion of his countenancing the doctrine which they had condemned. But Innocent was a man of great subtlety and address; and he found out, at last, an expedient to extricate himself

out of that perplexity, and gratify the fathers of both councils, without either approving or condemning their past conduct. The only thing they required of him was to join his authority with theirs, in condemning the Pelagian heresy; and that he readily did. But, lest in so doing, he should seem to approve of their having condemned it without first consulting him, in his answer to their letters, he supposed them to have actually consulted him; nay, to have referred to him the final decision of that controversy; and, agreeably to that supposition, he commends them for the deference they had thereby shown to the apostolic see. "You have well observed," says he, "the ordinances of the ancient fathers, and not trampled under foot what they, not in human wisdom, but by Divine order, have established; namely, that whatever is done in places, however remote, should, for a final conclusion, be referred to the apostolic see." And again, "You have had due regard to the honor of the apostolic see, I mean of him who has the charge and care of all churches, in consulting him in these perplexities, and intricate cases."<sup>1</sup> Thus did Innocent maintain his claim, and, at the same time, avoid quarrelling, at an improper season, with those who had acted in direct opposition to it. A necessary policy in the first setting up of such extravagant and groundless pretensions.

In the present letter he not only approves of the judgment given against Pelagius and Cælestius by the African bishops, but alleges several reasons in confutation of the doctrines they taught; and concludes, by declaring them cut off from the communion of the church, agreeably to the sentence of the African bishops, as men not only unworthy of that communion, but of human society, and even of life.<sup>2</sup> The same things he repeats in his answer to the bishops of Numidia; but he seems there to have been sensible, upon a more cool consideration, that, in his letter to the council of Carthage, he had strained his prerogative too high; and therefore in this he confines to matters of faith the general maxim, which he had laid down, concerning the obligation of referring all ecclesiastical matters, for a final decision, to the apostolic see. In the same letter he endeavors to confute, in particular, the doctrine of Pelagius, allowing children, who die without baptism, to partake of eternal life.<sup>3</sup> In his answer to the five bishops, he refers them for his real sentiments, concerning the doctrine of Pelagius, to the other two letters, adding, that he had read the book of Pelagius, which they had sent him, and found nothing in it that he liked, or rather that he did not dislike.<sup>4</sup>(\*)

<sup>1</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ep. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Idem. ep. 91. 93.

<sup>4</sup> Idem. ep. 96.

(\*) That the Pelagian heresy was first condemned by the African bishops, is a fact so well attested, that one would think it impossible it should ever have come



Cælestius condemned by the African bishops, notwithstanding his appeal to Rome. Innocent's letter to Jerom. His letter to John of Jerusalem. Innocent dies. The see of Rome greatly indebted to him for its grandeur.

Cælestius had been condemned by a council held at Carthage, in the year 412, and probably consisting of the same bishops who composed that of the year 416. From their sentence he appealed, as Baronius observes,<sup>1</sup> to the see of Rome, summoning his accuser, Paulinus, to appear at the same tribunal. But all we can infer from thence is, that either Innocent did not receive the appeal, or, if he did, that the African bishops made no account of it, since they condemned him anew, without waiting for the judgment of Innocent, to whom he had appealed.

Innocent wrote two letters more, a little before his death, one of which was to St. Jerom, comforting him in his distress. For some who favored Pelagius, provoked at Jerom's repeated invectives against him, had set fire to his monastery at Bethlehem, and burned it down to the ground, agreeably to the spirit and methods in which religious controversies were now carried on. Their design was to have burned Jerom himself; but he had the good luck to escape out of the flames, and save himself in a strong tower. The two noble virgins, Eustochium and her niece Paula, who led a retired life under the direction of Jerom, met with no better treatment. For those fanatics, breaking into the house where they lived, beat some of their attendants in their presence, killed others, and threatened them with fire and destruction. With this they acquainted Innocent, who thereupon wrote to Jerom, offering to exert the whole authority of the apostolic see against the authors of such excesses, provided he knew who they were: for the two virgins had concealed their names, probably to prevent his exerting that authority, which they had reason to apprehend would be attended with greater evils. Innocent adds, that so long as the authors and promoters of those unheard of barbarities are unknown, he can only condole with those who have suffered by them; but, if they were accused in due form, at his tribunal, he would not fail to appoint proper judges to try them; which, by the way, he had no right to do.

Innocent's other letter is to John, bishop of Jerusalem, who hated Jerom on account of his inveteracy against Origen, and was suspected to connive at the cruel treatment he and his followers had met with. Him, therefore, Innocent reprimands very severely, for suffering such enormous abuses within the

limits of his jurisdiction. In his letter he gives him the title of well-beloved brother; but at the same time treats him with more haughtiness than was becoming even in a superior, though he neither had, nor could claim by the canons, any kind of jurisdiction or authority over him.

These letters Innocent wrote in the latter end of January, and died on the 12th of March of the same year, 417, having governed the Roman church near fifteen years; for his predecessor Anastasius died on the 27th of April, 402, and he was chosen soon after his decease, as I have observed above. He was generally esteemed a man of good parts, and well acquainted with the laws and traditions of the church. Hence he was frequently consulted by the western, and sometimes by the eastern bishops, in points both of faith and discipline. Of this general esteem, and the deference that was thereupon paid to his decisions, he took advantage to lay down, with an air of authority, and as undoubted truths, many false, groundless and dangerous maxims, all tending to the diminution of the episcopal power and the advancement of the papal. The dignity of the apostolic see was, as we have seen, the burden of almost all his letters; he even improved it into a claim of supremacy; and we may say, with great truth, that to him the see of Rome was more indebted for the grandeur it afterwards gained, than to all his predecessors together. He formed the plan of that spiritual monarchy which they, by constant application, established at last, in spite of the many almost insurmountable difficulties which they had to contend with. He was the first who, changing the ancient foundation of the primacy, claimed it as the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, as he is styled, and not as the bishop of the first city, though on that consideration alone it had been granted by the councils. I said primacy, because the word supremacy was utterly unknown in those days. The council of Sardica, held in the year 347, had allowed, in some cases, and under several restrictions, appeals to be made to the see of Rome, as has been observed elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> But Innocent, scorning to owe any branch of his authority to that, or any other council, claimed, by divine right, the power of finally deciding all ecclesiastical controversies and disputes; which was claiming, by divine right, an unlimited jurisdiction. It is true, no regard was had to such claims; nor indeed did Innocent dare to pursue them, being well apprised of the opposition he would meet with, if he should then have made such an attempt. He therefore wisely contented himself with laying foundations, and thought it a great advance, as it certainly was, to have openly asserted such notions, and brought the ears of men to endure them,

into any man's thoughts to call it in question. And yet Baronius, upon the authority of a very doubtful passage out of St. Prosper, a contemporary writer, roundly asserts that heresy to have been first condemned, not by the African bishops, but by Innocent. (a) The words of Prosper are: "Pestem subeuntem prima recidit sedes Roma Petri." (b) These words are variously interpreted by the learned; but all agree in rejecting the interpretation of Baronius, as making (c) Prosper contradict a known truth.

(a) Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 26.

(b) Prosp. de Ingratis, l. 1. c. 2.

(c) Vide Jansenium de Hær. Pelag. p. 16. Merc. t. 1. p. 9.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 412. n. 25.

<sup>1</sup> Vide ante.



His decretals often quoted by the popish divines. Is sainted. Pelagius, his country, profession, parts, &c.

if not their minds. Had he gone farther, he would have been stopped in his career, and it might have proved fatal to the power of Rome before it was come to an age of maturity; but that he went thus far was of great benefit to it, because it made a beginning, and furnished his successors with a pretence to plead some antiquity for the opinions and principles upon which they proceeded.

Accordingly, the decretals of Innocent are frequently quoted by the advocates for the see of Rome, to show how early the popes claimed, by divine right, and as successors of St. Peter, a universal authority and jurisdiction. But if the principles, on which they founded their claims, were false in Innocent's time, they are still so in ours; if no account was then made of such claims, (and that none was made I have sufficiently shown,) no account ought to be made of them now, no

more than if they were dated but yesterday. Nor, indeed, ought the beginning of the fifth century to be esteemed an early time in the Christian church. Great corruptions were then crept into it; and, with regard to the point in question, it was very late. For had the bishop of Rome been supreme head of the church, in right of St. Peter, how came that supremacy to be unknown, and unheard of, for above four hundred years? If the four first centuries could not discover it, on what new light was it revealed to the fifth?

Innocent has been enrolled, by his successors, in the catalogue of saints; and he is now adored in the church of Rome as a saint of the first rate; an honor which, it must be confessed, he better deserved at their hands, in their estimation of merit, than any of his predecessors, or any of his successors, except Gregory VIIth.

## ZOSIMUS, FORTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER.]

Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was, according to the Bibliothecarian, a Greek by nation, and the son of one Abraham;<sup>1</sup> which is all we know of him before his election. He was elected and ordained six days after the death of his predecessor, that is, on the 18th of March, 417. (\*)

The first thing that engaged the attention of Zosimus, after his election, was the heresy of Pelagius, and his chief disciple, Cælestius, which, at that time, made a great noise in the church. Pelagius was by birth a Briton, and a monk by profession; but one of those who, parting with their estates, and renouncing all worldly honors, lived an austere life; but in no community, and under no rule. Such a monk was the famous Paulinus, such Pammachius, and such probably Pelagius; for I do not find, in any ancient writer, that he ever confined himself to a monastery; nay, the wandering life he led is a strong proof he never did. (†)

<sup>1</sup> Anas. c. 42.

(\*) Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, observes, at the year 443, that in 417, when Zosimus was bishop of Rome, Easter, which ought to have been kept on the 22d of April, was, by a mistake, kept on the 25th of March; (a) so that on the 25th of March, Zosimus was in possession of the see; and consequently must have been chosen and ordained on the 18th of that month, the only Sunday in 417, between the 12th of March, when Innocent died, and the 25th. For in those days bishops were commonly ordained on Sundays, and it is very certain, that Zosimus was ordained on that day, since he pretended the ordination of two bishops whom he deposed, to be null, because they had been ordained on another day. (b)

Theodoret makes Boniface the immediate successor of Innocent. (c) But all the other writers, without exception, place Zosimus between Innocent and Boniface.

(a) Leo, t. 1. p. 413.

(b) Conc. t. 2. p. 1569.

(c) Theod. l. 5. p. 751.

(†) He is commonly styled Pelagius the Briton, to

As to his parts, Jerom, who could never discover any thing commendable in those he opposed, speaks of him with the greatest contempt, as if he had no genius, and but very little knowledge.<sup>1</sup> But St. Austin, a more candid, and less passionate writer, owns him to have been a man of extraordinary good sense, of a very sprightly genius, of great penetration, and one who was not easily overcome, but rather capable of maintaining, with the strongest reasons that could be offered, the opinions which he once embraced.<sup>2</sup> He lived several years at Rome, at least from the year 400 to 411, and was there well known, and greatly esteemed. For St. Austin, who first heard of him, while he lived at Rome, spoke of him in the first books, which he wrote against him, as of a man, "who passed for a saint, who had made great progress in piety, whose life was chaste, and manners blameless, who had sold and given to the poor all he had," &c.<sup>3</sup> St. Paulinus and St. Jerom seem to have once entertained a no less favorable opinion of him in these respects, than St. Austin did; for they too, in some of their letters, speak of him with the greatest commendations. But he no sooner began to broach his new doctrines than he forfeited their good opinion, and with it every virtue which he had formerly possessed; nay, they pretend that he abandoned himself, at once, to immoderate eating and drinking, and to all manner of debauchery, passing his whole time in revels

distinguish him from Pelagius of Tarento, who lived about the same time. (d)

(d) Aug. ep. 106. Prosp. contra Ingrat. l. 1. c. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Jans. Hist. Pel. p. 2. <sup>2</sup> Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ep. 95. Pecc. Orig. c. 8—21, &c.



Cælestius, his family, profession, parts, &c. Their doctrine. Both pass over into Africa. Pelagius repairs to Palæstine. Cælestius accused and condemned in Africa. Appeals to Rome, but flies to Ephesus. Pelagius accused in Palæstine by Heros and Lazarus, two Gallican bishops; and absolved by the council of Diospolis.

and banquets, in caressing and pampering his body, which by that means, says Jerom, swelled to such an exorbitant size, that he was more capable of crushing his adversaries with the weight of his carcass than the weight of his arguments.<sup>1</sup> We shall find very few, if any at all, who, upon their teaching doctrines not approved by the fathers, have not been immediately transformed by them, out of their great zeal for the purity of the faith, into monsters of wickedness, though they themselves had perhaps proposed them before for patterns of every Christian virtue. It behoves us, therefore, to be very cautious in giving credit to what they say of those whom they style heretics. With respect to Pelagius, St. Austin, more moderate than the rest, does not charge him with any vices, but only ascribes to hypocrisy the virtues which he had admired in him before.<sup>2</sup>

Cælestius, the first and chief disciple of Pelagius, was, according to some, a native of Scotland or Ireland; according to others, of Campania, in Italy;<sup>3</sup> but, with respect to his country, nothing certain can be advanced. He was descended of an illustrious family, and had applied himself, from his youth, to the study of the law, and made some figure at the bar; but growing weary of that profession, he retired from the world, embraced a monastic life, and lived some years in a monastery;<sup>4</sup> St. Jerom speaks of him as a man of no genius or talents.<sup>5</sup> But St. Austin entertained a very different opinion of his parts; for he commends him as a good writer, as one who was thoroughly acquainted with all the subtleties of logic, and whose talents would have proved very serviceable, could he have been retrieved from his errors.<sup>6</sup>

The tenets of Pelagius or Cælestius (for those, who embraced them, are styled indifferently Pelagians and Cælestians) may be reduced to the following heads: 1. That we may, by our free-will, without the help of grace, do good, and avoid evil. 2. That if grace were necessary for either, God would be unjust in giving it to one, and denying it to another. 3. That faith, which is the first step to our justification, depends upon our free-will. 4. That the sin of Adam hurt none but him; that children are born in the state which he was in before the fall; that they are not delivered by baptism from eternal perdition, but, without baptism, partake of life everlasting. By life everlasting they meant, a middle state between eternal happiness and eternal misery. 5. That grace is only necessary to render the observance of the commandments more easy.

These opinions Pelagius and Cælestius first broached at Rome, about the year 405,

and gained there a great many followers; more says St. Austin, than could be well imagined.<sup>1</sup> They both left Rome in 410, or 411, and, crossing over into Africa, infected many there, says the same author, especially at Carthage, with their new doctrine.<sup>2</sup> Pelagius, after a short stay at Carthage, went first into Egypt, and from thence into Palæstine, where he continued a long time.<sup>3</sup> Cælestius remained at Carthage, hoping to be preferred there to the priesthood; but as he did not use the due caution in propagating his doctrine in that city, he was soon discovered, and accused by one Paulinus, a deacon, before a council, at which several bishops were present, and Aurelius of Carthage presided. The charge brought against him was, that he held the sin of Adam to have hurt him alone; that it could not be imputed to his descendants; and that no sin was cancelled by baptism. These tenets he did not own before the council; but neither would he disown or anathematize them; and therefore the bishops, provoked at his obstinacy, not only condemned his doctrine, but, at the same time, cut him off, as an incorrigible heretic, from the communion of the church.<sup>4</sup> From this sentence Cælestius appealed to the judgment of Innocent, then bishop of Rome, summoning Paulinus, his accuser, to make his charge good at that tribunal. But Cælestius himself laid, it seems, no stress on his appeal; for, instead of repairing to Rome, he fled to Ephesus,<sup>5</sup> where we shall leave him for the present.

Pelagius, in the mean time, was not idle in Palæstine, whither he had retired, as I have said above; but, being countenanced by John, bishop of Jerusalem, he gained daily such numbers of followers there, that Heros and Lazarus, two bishops of Gaul, whom I shall speak of hereafter, happening to be then in Palæstine, thought it incumbent upon them to accuse him to Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea, and metropolitan of Palæstine. They drew up a writing accordingly, containing the chief heads of the doctrine which Pelagius taught, together with the articles, for which his disciple Cælestius had been condemned by the council of Carthage; and this writing they presented to Eulogius. Hereupon a council was assembled soon after at Diospolis, a city of Palæstine, known in scripture by the name of Lydda. It consisted of fourteen bishops, and Eulogius of Cæsarea presided; but neither of the Gallican bishops was present, the one being prevented by a dangerous malady, and the other not choosing to abandon him in that condition. However, their charge against Pelagius was read, and he examined, by the fathers of the assembly, on the articles

<sup>1</sup> Hier. in Jer.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Jan. hist. Pel. l. 6. c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. in Jer. et Gernerius in Mar. Mercat.

<sup>4</sup> Gennad. de script. eccles. c. 44.

<sup>5</sup> Hier. ad Ctesiph. c. 3. <sup>6</sup> Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. ep. 89.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Gest. Pelag. c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. ep. 89. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. ib. et de Gest. Pel. 2. 11. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Oros. apol. p. 801.



He is accused by Heros and Lazarus to the bishops of Africa. The doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius condemned anew in Africa. They appeal to Rome. Cælestius is driven from Ephesus and Constantinople. Repairs to Rome, and presents himself before Zosimus. He delivers his confession of faith to Zosimus.

it contained. But as nobody appeared against him, as none of those bishops were sufficiently acquainted with the Latin tongue to understand his books, and he disowned some propositions, explained others in a catholic sense, and anathematized all who maintained doctrines repugnant to those of the catholic church, the council pronounced, at the suggestion of John of Jerusalem, the following sentence: "Since the monk Pelagius, here present, has satisfied us, as to his doctrine, and anathematized with us whatever is contrary to the true faith, we acknowledge him to be in the communion of the church."<sup>1</sup> This council St. Jerom styles, "the pitiful synod of Diospolis."<sup>2</sup> But St. Austin, instead of insulting them, calls them "holy and catholic judges;" and will not answer, that he himself might not have been deceived by the artifices of Pelagius, had he been one of his judges.<sup>3</sup>

Heros and Lazarus, surprised to hear that the fathers of the assembly had absolved Pelagius, and despairing of ever being able to get him condemned in the east, where his cause was openly espoused by the bishop of Jerusalem, resolved to apply to their brethren in the west, especially to the bishops of Africa, who they well knew could not be prejudiced in his favor, since they had already condemned his favorite disciple, Cælestius. Pursuant to this resolution, they wrote, by the famous Orosius, who was returning from Palæstine to Africa, to the bishops of that province, accusing Pelagius and Cælestius as the authors of an execrable sect; giving them a particular account of what had passed in the council of Diospolis, and acquainting them with the wonderful progress the new heresy made in the east, especially in Palæstine.<sup>4</sup>

These letters were delivered by Orosius to the bishops of the province of Carthage, who, after having caused them to be read in the provincial council, which was then sitting in that city, and, with them, the acts of the council, which had been held five years before against Cælestius, not only condemned the doctrine ascribed to him and Pelagius, but declared, that the same sentence should be pronounced against them, unless they anathematized, in the plainest and most distinct terms, the errors with which they were charged.<sup>5</sup> The example of the bishops of Africa was followed by those of Numidia, assembled at Milevum, and by Innocent, bishop of Rome, as I have related above.

This condemnation, so solemn and general, was attended with the wished for effect. It greatly lessened the reputation of Pelagius and Cælestius, staggered many of their followers, and deterred others from embracing

their doctrines. Of this both Pelagius and Cælestius were well apprised; and, at the same time, sensible, that the only means of retrieving their credit, and maintaining the ground they had gained, was to justify themselves either to the bishops of Africa, or to the bishop of Rome, they chose the latter, thinking it more easy to gain over one than many. Besides, in Africa they knew St. Austin, who was in great reputation there, and swayed all the councils as he pleased, to be their declared and irreconcilable enemy; whereas they had many friends at Rome; and, among, the rest, the presbyter Sixtus, who was afterwards raised to that see.<sup>1</sup> In order, therefore, to persuade the bishop of Rome, as Pelagius had done the bishops of Diospolis, that they had been falsely and maliciously accused, Pelagius wrote a letter to Innocent, whose death he had not yet heard of, while Cælestius, trusting to his eloquence, and depending on the favor which the bishops of Rome had always shown to those who recurred to them, undertook a journey to that city. He had fled from Carthage to Ephesus, as I have related above. On his arrival in that city he was well received by the bishop of the place, and even preferred, after he had stayed some time there, to the priesthood. But, in the mean time, his doctrine giving offence to some, while it was embraced by others, great disturbances arose; and he was, in the end, driven out of the city. Being thus expelled from Ephesus, he repaired to Constantinople; but he no sooner began to discover his sentiments there, than Atticus, who then held that see, and kept a watchful eye over him, commanded him forthwith to depart the city.<sup>2</sup> From Constantinople he went straight to Rome; and, finding that Innocent was dead, he presented himself before his successor, Zosimus, declaring, that he was come to Rome, to defend his oppressed innocence at the tribunal of the apostolic see; not doubting but he should make it appear before so knowing and unprejudiced a judge, and confute the many groundless aspersions with which his enemies had strove to blast his reputation in the eyes of the whole church: he complained of the judgment given against him by the African bishops about six years before; and, pretending that his accuser, Paulinus, conscious of his innocence, and his own guilt, had declined the judgment of the apostolic see, he summoned him anew to appear, and make good the charge which he had brought against him. At the same time he presented to Zosimus a request, containing a confession of his faith, with long descants on the articles of the apostolic symbol, concerning which his orthodoxy had never been questioned. But as to grace and original sin, he said, they were not matter of faith; but that

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 6. 11. <sup>2</sup> Hier. *ibid.*

20. 29, 30, 35. ep. 96. <sup>3</sup> Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 1. vide 106. Hier. ep. 79.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. ep. 90.

<sup>5</sup> *Idem ibid.* ep. 95.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Pecc. Orig. c. 8. ad Bon. 1. 2. c. 3. ep. 104, 105. Prosp. in collat.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ep. 90. 92. Hier. in Jer. Mercator. com. c. 1.



Cælestius' confession approved by Zosimus. The Roman catholic divines strive in vain to excuse Zosimus. His haughty letter to the African bishops in favor of Cælestius. The characters of Heros, Lazarus, and Patroculus.

he was, nevertheless, ready to acquiesce, even with respect to them, in the judgement of the Roman see.<sup>1</sup>

Zosimus had at this time some affairs of the greatest importance on his hands;<sup>2</sup> but, highly pleased with the pretended submission of Cælestius, and thinking this a favorable opportunity of extending his authority, and drawing to the tribunal of the apostolic see appeals in causes which had been judged and decided elsewhere, he postponed the other affairs to attend to this alone, in his opinion, the most important of all. A day was appointed, without loss of time, for Cælestius to appear in the church of St. Clement, and there give an account of his faith. He appeared accordingly; and the confession being read, which he had delivered to Zosimus, he owned that, and no other, to be his faith. In that confession he did not deny original sin, but declared, in the clearest terms, that he was in doubt about it; and that the belief of original sin was no article of the catholic faith. And yet such a confession was approved by Zosimus as catholic; which was approving, if not the doctrine, at least, the doubts which Cælestius entertained of original sin.<sup>3</sup> The Roman catholic divines have taken great pains to clear Zosimus from this imputation; but have been attended with no better success than St. Austin was before them. For that father, unwilling to condemn one of his brethren, pretended that Zosimus, in approving the confession of Cælestius, did not declare his doctrine to be catholic, but only the disposition of his mind to condemn whatever should be found amiss in his doctrine; for such a disposition, says he, makes a true catholic:<sup>4</sup> he might have added, if sincere, and not feigned; for it was certainly feigned in Cælestius; and consequently Zosimus was no less mistaken in declaring his disposition of mind to be catholic, than if he had made such a declaration with respect to his doctrine. St. Austin himself was sensible of the weakness of his plea, and therefore immediately added; "But, allowing the doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius to have been approved by the Roman church, all we can infer from thence is, that the Roman clergy was guilty of prevarication;"<sup>5</sup> an inference which he seems to be no way solicitous about, though he could not have admitted it without giving up the question, if he had thought the pope infallible.

Zosimus, however prejudiced in favor of Cælestius, did not take upon him to restore him to the communion of the church, from which he had been cut off by the bishops of Africa, six years before, or to come to any farther resolution till he had imparted the af-

fair to them. He wrote accordingly to Aurelius of Carthage, and to the other African bishops; not that he stood in need of their advice, or wanted to be directed by them, as he let them know in his letter, but because he was willing to hear what they had to object against one who had been first accused at their tribunal. He upbraids those prelates, and with great bitterness and acrimony, as if they had acted with too much haste and precipitation in an affair which required the most mature deliberation. As for Heros and Lazarus, the two great opposers of Pelagius and Cælestius, he inveighs against them with the most abusive language that an implacable rage could suggest. He lets the African bishops know, that if the accusers of Cælestius did not appear at Rome in two months, to make good their charge against him, he would declare him innocent, and admit him as a true catholic to his communion. He styles all such inquiries, that is, inquiries concerning grace and original sin, empty speculations, and trifling disputes, owing to a criminal curiosity, and an immoderate desire of speaking and writing; in which perhaps he was not much to blame: he closes his letter with exhorting them not to trust to their own judgment, but to adhere in every thing to the scripture and tradition.<sup>1</sup>

As for Heros and Lazarus, against whom Zosimus chiefly vented his spleen, while he favored Cælestius; St. Prosper gives us, in his Chronicle, the following account of the former: "Heros," says he, "was bishop of Arles, a holy man, and the disciple of St. Martin. However, he was driven from his see by his own people, though quite innocent, and not even accused of any fault. In his room was placed one Patroculus, an intimate friend of count Constantius, who at that time bore a great sway in the empire, and whose favor they courted, and hoped to earn by that violence." This happened in 412. All we know of Lazarus is, that he was ordained bishop of Aix, in Provence, by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, a prelate of extraordinary merit, as appears from the high commendations bestowed on him by the council of Turin,<sup>2</sup> by St. Jerom,<sup>3</sup> and by Tiro Prosper in his Chronicle. Patroculus, who was intruded in the room of Heros, is painted by Tiro Prosper, a writer no ways prejudiced against the Pelagians, or their friends, as a man of a most abandoned life, and one who turned the episcopacy into a trade, and sold the priesthood to all who had money to purchase it.<sup>4</sup> Baronius interprets the violent death, which he suffered in 426, when he was barbarously murdered by a military tribune, as a punishment from Heaven for his criminal intrusion.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30. 33. Peccat. Orig. c. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Bar. ad ann. 417.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Idem ad Bon. ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ibid.

<sup>1</sup> Mercat. comm. c. 1. Vide Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 19, 20, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1115.

<sup>3</sup> Hier. ep. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Tiro Prosp. p. 51.

<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 425. n. 26.



Heros and Lazarus falsely charged with many crimes by Zosimus. They are both degraded and excommunicated by Zosimus. The injustice of this sentence. The other bishops make no account of the anathemas of Zosimus. Pelagius transmits to Zosimus a confession of his faith.

Such were the characters of Heros, Lazarus, and Patroclus; and yet of the latter, who favored the Pelagians, Zosimus entertained the highest opinion, and often commends him in his letters as a man of great merit and virtue. But the two former, who had distinguished themselves above the rest in opposing the Pelagians, he most outrageously abuses, styling them, in his second letter to the African bishops, two plagues, who, with their nonsensical whims, disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the whole church; whirlwinds and storms, that could suffer none to enjoy any quiet. He adds, that he was not at all surprised at their wickedly attempting to defame with false depositions, and lying evidences, a layman, meaning Pelagius, who had served God so long with an untainted reputation, and shining virtues, since they had raised so many storms in the church, had contrived so many plots, employed so many engines, to compass the ruin of their brethren and colleagues in the episcopacy.<sup>1</sup> No mention is made by the historians of those times of any other storms or disturbances in the churches of Gaul, but such as were occasioned by the expulsion of Heros, and the intrusion of Patroclus; and these Patroclus probably exaggerated beyond measure, laying the whole blame on Heros. For Patroclus was in Rome at the very time Zosimus wrote his letter to the African bishops, fraught with invectives against Heros and Lazarus.<sup>2</sup> In the same letter Zosimus charges the two prelates with several other crimes; namely, that they had both been ordained against the canons, and against the will of the people as well as the clergy, whom, however, they had forced by chains, prisons, confiscations, and the favor of the tyrant, meaning, no doubt, the usurper Constantine, to consent in the end to their election; that Lazarus had ascended the episcopal throne, while his hands were still reeking with innocent blood, &c. But, had they been guilty of such excesses, would Prosper, who lived at this very time, and all the other historians, have passed them over in silence? Would he have styled Heros a holy man? Would St. Austin have called them both his holy brethren?<sup>3</sup> Would the fathers of the council of Carthage in 416, have acknowledged them for their fellow-laborers and colleagues in the priesthood?<sup>4</sup> Would Proculus of Marseilles, one of the most illustrious prelates at that time in Gaul, have ordained Lazarus, while his hands were still reeking with innocent blood? We may therefore, upon the whole, agree here with Baronius,<sup>5</sup> and ascribe the crimes, of which the two prelates were arraigned by Zosimus, to the suggestions of their enemies, especially of Patroclus, in whom Zosimus reposed an

entire confidence. However that be, Zosimus, highly incensed against both, not only declared them deposed, as men unworthy of the episcopal dignity, but cut them off from his communion, "For many reasons," says he, "and, among the rest, because they had deposed themselves."<sup>1</sup>

This sentence he pronounced in their absence, without even acquainting them with the crimes laid to their charge; not reflecting, in the height of his passion, that he was, at that very time, complaining of the African bishops for having condemned Cælestius in his absence, reproaching them with too much haste and precipitation, and laying it down as a rule never to be swerved from, that no man ought to be condemned before he is heard, let the crimes laid to his charge be ever so great. As for their deposing themselves, or voluntarily abdicating their dignity, it is very certain, if Prosper is to be credited, that Heros did not abdicate, but was violently driven from his see. If Lazarus abdicated, (for Cardinal Noris<sup>2</sup> and others<sup>3</sup> are of opinion he did not,) that ought not to have been imputed to him as a crime, any more than it was to Nazianzen, bishop of Constantinople, and many others, who were not even censured by their enemies on that account. The other bishops seem to have made no account of the anathemas of Zosimus; for they still continued to communicate with them, and acknowledge them for their colleagues;<sup>4</sup> the name of Heros was inserted into the diptychs of the church of Arles after his death; and Lazarus was, according to some, even restored to his see.<sup>5</sup>

Not long after Zosimus had written the letter, which I have mentioned above, to the bishops of Africa, in favor of Cælestius, he received one from Praylius, bishop of Jerusalem, warmly recommending to him the cause of Pelagius; and another from Pelagius himself, in his own vindication, and with it a confession of his faith. These letters were directed to Innocent; but he being dead before they reached Rome, they were delivered to Zosimus. In the Confession of Faith, Pelagius owned that "baptism ought to be administered to children as well as to the adult," and that, "notwithstanding our free will, we want the assistance of grace."<sup>6</sup> Neither of these propositions was inconsistent with, or repugnant to, his doctrine; for though he denied original sin, he allowed baptism to be administered even to children, but only for their sanctification. He admitted the necessity of grace, but not grace as that word was understood by St. Austin, and the other bishops who opposed him; for by grace he meant no more than the remission

<sup>1</sup> Bar. *ibid.*<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1571.<sup>3</sup> Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 16.<sup>4</sup> Idem ep. 90.<sup>5</sup> Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 23. 20.<sup>1</sup> Bar. *ibid.* n. 27, 28, 29. <sup>2</sup> Noris Hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 12.<sup>3</sup> Gallia Christiana, t. 1. <sup>4</sup> Merc. comment. c. 3.

p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Gall. Christ. *ibid.*<sup>6</sup> Aug. Gr. Ch. c. 30. & Pecc. Orig. c. 18, 19.



Zosimus approves of the confession of faith of Pelagius; and censures the African bishops for condemning him. The African bishops maintain their former judgment. Paulinus, summoned to Rome, refuses to obey the summons. The council of Carthage condemns anew the Pelagian doctrine without waiting for the judgment of Zosimus. The policy of the African bishops.

of sins, instruction, the example of Christ. In this confession he did not disown any of his tenets; but, not thinking it safe or advisable openly to own them, he industriously declined explaining himself more distinctly on either of the above-mentioned heads. Zosimus, however, fully satisfied with his confession, and quite astonished (to use his own words) at the rash proceedings of the African bishops, in condemning, as heretics, men whose doctrine was so sound and orthodox, immediately transmitted to Aurelius of Carthage, and his colleagues in Africa, the confession as well as the letter, which had been sent him by Pelagius. On this occasion he wrote himself a second letter to the African bishops, which we may justly style a panegyric on Pelagius and Cælestius, and a bitter invective against their accusers, Heros and Lazarus. This letter he concludes with exhorting the bishops of Africa to the love of peace and unity, and condemning, as guilty of an injustice unknown even to the pagan Romans, those who gave judgment in the absence of the persons accused, what crimes soever were laid to their charge,<sup>1</sup> as I have observed above.

The African bishops were no less surprised to find Zosimus so warmly engaged in favor of Pelagius and Cælestius, than Zosimus was surprised at their having condemned them. However, they were determined to stand to the judgment which they had given, though sensible that such a determination would not fail to produce, if Zosimus did not yield, a misunderstanding, and perhaps an entire separation, between Rome and Africa. This St. Austin seems chiefly to have apprehended, and to have been resolved, if it should so happen, to abdicate and retire.<sup>2</sup> To prevent this evil, which would have proved very detrimental to the common cause, many letters passed between Rome and Africa:<sup>3</sup> but as none of those that were written at this juncture by the African bishops, have reached our times, having been probably destroyed by those whose interest it was to destroy them; all we know concerning this affair is, that the Africans maintained, with great steadiness, their former judgment against the pretensions of Zosimus; and would never allow a cause that had been determined in Africa, to be re-examined at Rome, the rather as Innocent, the predecessor of Zosimus, had concurred with them in condemning both Cælestius and his doctrine.<sup>4</sup> The letter from Zosimus to the African bishops was carried by one Basilius, sub-deacon of Rome, who was charged with a verbal order for the deacon Paulinus, the first who accused Cælestius, to repair to Rome. To this summons

Paulinus returned answer, that as the bishops of Africa had condemned Cælestius upon his accusation, it was no longer incumbent upon him, but upon them, to show that his accusation was well grounded; and therefore he could not conceive why Zosimus should require him to take a journey to Rome.<sup>1</sup>

In the meantime, Aurelius of Carthage was under the greatest apprehension, lest Zosimus should be prevailed upon by Cælestius, and the other Pelagians at Rome, to take some hasty step in their favor. Having therefore assembled, with all possible expedition, a council at Carthage, he first wrote, in his own and their name, to Zosimus, earnestly entreating him to suspend all further proceedings in an affair of such moment, till he was more fully informed. This letter was written, and a messenger despatched with it to Rome, while the council was yet very thin; the haste Aurelius was in to stop the proceedings of Zosimus not allowing him to wait the arrival of all. When the rest came, and they were in all two hundred and fourteen, they unanimously confirmed their former sentence, and, without waiting for the judgment of Zosimus, condemned anew the doctrine of Pelagius and Cælestius.<sup>2</sup> The decrees, which they made on this occasion against the Pelagians, were received, says Prosper, by Rome, by the emperors, no doubt, Honorius and Arcadius, and by the whole world.<sup>3</sup> And yet, in the making of these decrees the bishop of Rome had no hand; so that it was not Rome, but Africa, it was not the pope, but the bishops of Africa, or, more truly, St. Austin, (for he governed entirely that council,) who taught the church what she was to believe, and what disbelieve, concerning grace and original sin. One of these decrees is related by Prosper,<sup>4</sup> wherein the two hundred and fourteen bishops declare, that "we are aided by grace, not only in the knowledge, but in the practice, of virtue; and that without it we can neither think, speak, or do any thing whatsoever that is pious or holy."<sup>5</sup> This, and the other decrees of the council, were sent immediately to Rome by the fathers, who composed them, with a letter for Zosimus, declaring that they were determined to adhere to the judgment, which his predecessor, Innocent, had formerly given against Pelagius and Cælestius, till such time as both owned, and in the most plain and unexceptionable terms, the necessity of grace, and abjured the opposite doctrine. It was the effect of a refined policy in the African bishops not to mention their own judgment, but to lay the whole stress on that of Innocent, though his was not only preceded, but produced, or rather extorted, by theirs. They hoped that the regard, which they pre-

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 25. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 195. 209.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. ib. & Bar. ad ann. 413. n. 4. & Quesnel. in Leon. opera, p. 676.

<sup>1</sup> Quesnel. ibid. p. 675. <sup>2</sup> Prosp. chr. & in coll. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Prosp. chron. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Prosp. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Idem ibid. ;



Zosimus begins to yield. His boasting letter to the African bishops. The doctrine of Pelagius condemned again in a council at Carthage. Appeals beyond sea forbidden by the council, on pain of excommunication. Law enacted by Honorius against the Pelagians.

tended to have for Innocent, would bring Zosimus to a better temper, and divert him from absolving those whom his predecessor had so lately condemned. As Zosimus had reproached them in his letter for believing too easily those who had appeared against Cælestius, they, in their turn, represented to him, that he ought not so easily to have believed Cælestius, and those who spoke in his favor. In the same letter, they gave him a particular account of all that had passed in Africa concerning Cælestius. No wonder, therefore, that Zosimus should have complained of the length of the letter, calling it a volume, and saying<sup>1</sup> that "he had got through it at last." With this letter, Marcellinus, sub-deacon of the church of Carthage, was despatched to Rome, and he arrived there in the beginning of March, 418.

Zosimus was alarmed at the steadiness of the Africans. He plainly saw from their letter, and more plainly from their decrees, that they were determined not to yield; and therefore, apprehending the evil consequences that would infallibly attend his continuing to protect Pelagius and Cælestius against them, he resolved to yield, and withdraw, by degrees, his protection from both. Hence, in his answer to the council, he contented himself with setting forth and boasting the pre-eminence, authority, and prerogatives of the apostolic see; which however, more modest than his predecessor, he did not ascribe to divine institution, but to the canons of the church, and prescription. He tells the African bishops, that though he is vested with a power of judging all causes, though his judgment is irreversible, yet he had chosen to determine nothing without having first consulted them; and this he dwells upon as an extraordinary favor. He expresses great surprise at their seeming to be persuaded, that he had given an entire credit to Cælestius; assures them that he had not been so hasty, being well apprised that the last and definite judgment ought not to be given but with the greatest caution, and after the most mature deliberation; and in the close of his letter lets them know, that, upon the receipt of their first letter, he had suspended all further proceedings; and, to gratify them, left things in the state they were in before.<sup>2</sup>

In the mean time the African bishops, assembling in council at Carthage, from all the provinces of Africa, and some even from Spain, the more effectually to oppose and defeat any further attempts of Zosimus, in favor of Pelagius and Cælestius, condemned their doctrine anew, and more distinctly than they had hitherto done. This council met on the 1st of May, 418, consisted of 225 bishops, and enacted eight canons, anathematizing the Pe-

lagian doctrine concerning grace and original sin.<sup>1</sup> To these eight canons they added ten more, calculated to establish some points of discipline. Among the latter, the ninth deserves particular notice; for it is there decreed, that presbyters, deacons, and inferior clerks, if they complain of the judgment of their own bishop, may appeal, with his consent, to the neighboring bishops, and from them to the primate or council of Africa. "But, if any one should presume," say they, "to appeal beyond sea, let no man receive him to his communion."<sup>2</sup> To this decree Gratian has added, to save the jurisdiction of the pope, "unless they appeal to the see of Rome;" than which nothing can be more absurd, since it was to restrain the encroaching power of the see of Rome that this canon was made. We must not forget, that St. Austin was present at this council, and signed this, as well as the other canons and decrees, that were, on this occasion, enacted by the 225 bishops.

The Africans had despatched, the year before, the bishop Vindemialis to the court of Honorius, with the decrees of the council held against Pelagius, of which I have spoken above. And those decrees the emperor not only approved, but enacted this year, 418, a severe law against the Pelagians, dated from Ravenna, the 30th of April, and addressed to Palladius, then præfectus prætorio. Honorius there declares, he had been informed, that Pelagius and Cælestius taught, in opposition to the authority of the catholic church, that God had created the first man mortal; that he would have died, whether he had or had not sinned; that his sin did not pass to his descendants; and several other impious errors, that disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the church. To put a stop therefore to the growing evil, he commands Pelagius and Cælestius to be driven from Rome; orders it to be every where notified, that all persons shall be admitted before the magistrates, as informers against those who are suspected of holding their wicked doctrines; and such as are found guilty shall be sent into exile.<sup>3</sup> In virtue of this law, an order was issued by the præfecti prætorio, namely, by Junius Quartus Palladius, prefect of Italy, Monaxius, prefect of the east, and Agricola, prefect of Gaul, commanding Pelagius and Cælestius to be driven out of Rome, and the accomplices of their errors to be stripped of their estates, and condemned to perpetual banishment.<sup>4</sup> A most barbarous treatment for holding opinions, which, if erroneous, were certainly harmless. But it is usual for a persecuting spirit to be as violent upon the most unessential as the most weighty points: and the rage of dispu-

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. *ibid.* l. 1. c. 2. Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 8. Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 5. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Conc. l. 2. p. 1121. Aug. ep. 47.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. l. 2. p. 1064. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 4. Nor. hist. Pel. p. 88.



Zosimus summons Cælestius to appear before him, and to condemn his doctrine. Cælestius instead of appearing retires from Rome. Zosimus condemns the confession, which he had approved before. Excommunicates Pelagius and Cælestius; and writes a circular letter against them. Some bishops refuse to sign it, and send a confession of their faith to Zosimus.

tation is never more keen, than when the disputants can hardly define what they quarrel about; especially when the sword of the magistrate is drawn on that side which has least to say for itself in reason and argument. I do not affirm this was the case in the present dispute; but this is certain, that if Pelagius went too far in his opinion, so did his opposers in theirs: and so far his conduct was infinitely better than theirs, that he declared his own notions to be matters very indifferent to catholic faith, and professed a general assent to that faith; whereas they anathematized his opinions as execrable errors, and punished them with all the severity that the most implacable malice could exert. (\*)

Pelagius and Cælestius being thus condemned by the decrees of the African bishops, by the law of the emperor, and even by the voice of the people, or rather of the populace, who were every where ready, but no where more than at Rome, to rise against the "enemies of grace," as they were styled, and their abettors; Zosimus thought it not safe to afford them any further protection, unless Cælestius, who was still at Rome, (the imperial law not being yet published there) consented to anathematize the doctrines ascribed to him and Pelagius, in such clear and precise terms as should leave no room, even for his enemies, to question his sincerity. He therefore appointed a day for the Roman clergy, and the neighboring bishops, to assemble; and, acquainting Cælestius with this resolution, he summoned him to appear at the time appointed, that, by condemning whatever he should be required to condemn, he might be publicly restored to the communion of the church, from which he had been cut off by the African bishops. Cælestius was greatly perplexed with this summons: he conceived it impossible to dissemble any longer his real sentiments; but, at the same time, thinking it base to renounce them, and foreseeing the consequences that would infallibly attend his avowing them, after he had been long in suspense what expedient to resolve on, he concluded at last, that the best and safest was, privately to withdraw from Rome, and keep himself concealed till the present storm was blown over. This expedient he chose, and put it in execution with such secrecy, that he was no more heard of till three years after, when he appeared again in Rome.<sup>1</sup>

In the mean time the appointed day came; but Cælestius did not appear: he was summoned anew, and the proceedings were adjourned for a few days; but as he still absented himself, and no tidings could be heard of

him, Zosimus was so provoked in seeing himself thus deluded, that without further examination, he condemned the confession of faith, which he had approved before; confirmed the sentence of the Africans, which he had so sharply censured; and anathematizing the doctrine both of Pelagius and Cælestius, declared the one and the other cut off from the communion of the church, if they did not publicly renounce and abjure "the poisonous tenets of their impious and abominable sect."<sup>1</sup> He did not stop here; but, to retrieve his reputation, which had suffered greatly on this occasion, and to atone by an opposite zeal, for that which he had hitherto exerted in their favor, he wrote a long circular letter to all the bishops, anathematizing the doctrine of Pelagius, and exhorting them to follow his example. Copies of this letter were sent into all the provinces of the Christian world, and out of so great a number of bishops eighteen only were found, who refused to receive it, and confirm, with their subscriptions, the anathemas it contained.<sup>2</sup>

As for the eighteen bishops, who refused to join the rest, they alleged, that they could not, in conscience, condemn any man in his absence, and that it was but just they should first hear what he had to plead in his defence, quoting to that purpose the very passages of scripture which Zosimus had quoted in his letter to the Africans, censuring them for condemning Pelagius in his absence. They added, that, as for Pelagius and Cælestius, they had both condemned, in their writings, the errors imputed to them; and therefore did not deserve, in their opinion, the anathemas that Rome and Africa had, perhaps too hastily, thundered against them. Julian, bishop of Eclana in Campania, one of the eighteen, and the most distinguished among them, wrote two letters on this subject to Zosimus, one of which was signed by them all, and contained a confession of their faith, agreeing in the most material points, with the confessions of Pelagius and Cælestius. For there they absolutely reject, and in the strongest terms, original sin, under the name of natural sin; but allow (and in this article alone they differ from Pelagius) that by the sin of Adam, death was let into the world. They entreat Zosimus to acquaint them with what should be found amiss in their confession; but beg that he would not think of employing force, since no force, but that of conviction, could produce in them a change of sentiments. They let him know, in the end of their letter, that they have already appealed to the judgment of an oecumenical council.<sup>3</sup> Zosimus was so provoked at this appeal, that, upon the receipt

(\*) Honorius supposes, and likewise his prefects, Pelagius to have been in Rome, when this law was enacted; but it is very certain, that he was then in Palestine.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mar. Merc. comm. c. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 3, & 4. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mercat. ubi supra. Prosp. chr. & Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. Conc. t. 3. p. 349. Prosp. chr. Mer. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Merc. subnot. p. 320—326.



The bishops condemned and degraded by Zosimus. They recur to the emperor for a general council; who issues several laws against them. The Pelagian doctrine condemned by two councils in the east. Pelagius driven from Jerusalem. Cælestius returns to Rome. Law issued against him. Is banished all Italy. Is driven from Constantinople, together with Julian, and the other Pelagian bishops.

of the letter, he assembled, in great haste, a council, consisting of the Roman clergy, and the neighboring bishops; and, having caused the letter to be read in their presence, he condemned anew Pelagius and Cælestius, and with them Julian, and the other bishops, who signed it, declaring them guilty of the same errors, and in consequence thereof degraded, as incorrigible heretics, from the episcopal dignity. The prelates, thus degraded, had recourse to the emperor Honorius, complaining of the undeserved severity of Zosimus, and entreating him to convene, by his authority, an oecumenical council, to the judgment of which they were ready to submit both themselves and their doctrine. The emperor seemed at first inclined to grant them their request. But count Valerius, a great friend of St. Austin, and then very powerful at court, not only diverted Honorius from it, but prevailed upon him to enact a law, banishing from Italy Julian, and with him all the bishops, whom Zosimus had deposed.<sup>1</sup> This law was soon followed by another, commanding all bishops to sign the condemnation of Pelagius and Cælestius, on pain of deposition, and perpetual banishment.<sup>2</sup> The Pelagians interpreted their being refused a council, as a token of victory; whence Julian, in a letter which he wrote to his friends in Rome, insults his adversaries, as if they had distrusted their cause, and therefore declined the judgment of an oecumenical council.<sup>3</sup> In another place he reproaches St. Austin, in particular, for courting the friendship of men in power, especially of count Valerius, with no other view but to crush, by their means, those whom he could not convince. St. Austin answered, "That recourse indeed had been had to men in power; but that the Pelagians ought rather to be thankful than complain, on that score, since it was not to crush them, or to do them the least hurt (for they were only driven from their sees, and banished for life), that the interest and power of great men had been made use of, but merely to reclaim them from their sacrilegious temerity."<sup>4</sup> Might not a Decius, a Dioclesian, or any other persecutor of the church, have used the same plea to justify his persecution?

About this time, that is, in the latter end of the year 418, or the beginning of 419, the doctrine of Pelagius was condemned in a council held at Antioch, at which presided Theodosius, bishop of that city; and in another, that met about the year 421, in Cilicia, under the famous Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, who had been hitherto an avowed patron of the Pelagians, had received Julian when driven out of Italy, and even written a book

against St. Austin, in defence of the Pelagian doctrine.<sup>1</sup> His conversion was perhaps owing, as that of many others certainly was, to the severe laws enacted against the Pelagians. Soon after the council of Antioch, Pelagius, whom Jerom styles the second Cataline, was driven from Jerusalem, where he had lived a long time, and obliged to fly to some other place for shelter.<sup>2</sup> Whither he retired, or what became of him afterwards, is not recorded. St. Austin supposes both him and Cælestius to have been still alive, while he was writing against Julian, that is, about the year 421.<sup>3</sup> As for Cælestius, it appears from a rescript, or rather a letter, of the emperor Constantius to Volusianus, prefect of Rome, in 421, that he was then in that city. For Constantius writes to Volusianus, that though he had enacted some laws against the ancient as well as the modern heresies, yet he was informed, that they made daily great progress; and therefore, to prevent the disturbances that must arise from thence, he commands the laws to be put in execution, and the enemies of the true religion to be carefully sought for, especially Cælestius, and to be banished, if apprehended, an hundred miles from Rome. To this letter the emperor added, with his own hand, by way of postscript, that the reputation of Volusianus depended on the punctual execution of this order.<sup>4</sup> In obedience to the emperor's commands, Volusianus issued a proclamation, banishing Cælestius an hundred miles from Rome, and threatening with proscription all who should presume to conceal him.<sup>5</sup> Cælestius, however, appeared again in Rome three years after, and even applied to Cælestine, then in that see, to have his cause examined anew. But Cælestine, rejecting his request with indignation, caused him to be banished all Italy.<sup>6</sup> From Rome he repaired to Constantinople, with Julian, and the other bishops of the Pelagian party, who all met there with a more kind reception. The emperor Theodosius the Younger was even inclined to assemble, at their request, a great council; and Nestorius, then bishop of Constantinople, wrote to the pope in their favor. But, in the meantime, Marius Mercator having composed, and presented to the emperor, a memorial against them, they were ordered by Theodosius, in virtue of that memorial, to depart the city.<sup>7</sup> Of Cælestius no farther mention is made by any of the ancients. As for Julian, he wandered, for several years, from place to place, being every where abhorred, detested, and driven out by the populace, as if his presence had been enough to draw down from heaven some remarkable judgment upon them. However, he found an asylum at last in a small

<sup>1</sup> Aug. op. imperf. l. 1. c. 10. ad Val. p. 343. Conc. t. 2. p. 1558.

<sup>2</sup> Mer. Com. c. 3. Nor. hist. Pel. l. 1. c. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 1. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. op. imperf. l. 2. c. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Merc. comm. c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Hier. ep. 55.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 2. c. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Phot. c. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Prosp. in coll. c. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Garn. in Mercat. p. 144.



Julian dies in Sicily. His birth, education, &c. The Semipelagian doctrine. The system of the Jesuits founded on the Semipelagian doctrine.

village of Sicily, where he earned a livelihood by keeping a school, till the year 455, when he died, after he had divested himself of all he had, to relieve the poor of the place in a great famine.<sup>1</sup> He was a man of a sprightly genius, thoroughly acquainted with the scriptures, well versed in all the branches of polite literature, especially in the Greek and Latin poets, and once famous among the doctors of the church.<sup>2</sup> He was descended from an illustrious family. His father was an Italian bishop, for whom St. Austin, notwithstanding his irreconcilable aversion to the son, professed the greatest friendship and veneration.<sup>3</sup> His mother was a lady of the first quality, and yet more commendable for her virtue than her birth.<sup>4</sup> His enemies, envying him even his noble descent, strove to rob him of that honour, small as it, in comparison of his other endowments, by giving out that he was a supposititious child.<sup>5</sup> He was admitted by his father among the clergy, when he was yet very young, and married, when he was of a more mature age, to a lady named Ja, of a senatorial, nay, of the Æmilian family, and the daughter of Æmilius, bishop of Benevento.<sup>6</sup> St. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, did not think it beneath him to write an epithalamium on this occasion, of a most singular kind; for he advises him and his bride to continue virgins, and observe continency.<sup>7</sup> A very extraordinary advice on a wedding day! That the married couple agreed to it then, we are not told; but, not long after, probably on the death of his wife, Julian bound himself to the observance of continency; for he was ordained deacon, and soon after raised to the see of Eclana.<sup>8</sup> He had, long before, embraced the Pelagian doctrine; and was so fully convinced of the truth of it, that he often declared, if Pelagius himself should renounce his doctrine, yet he would not.<sup>9</sup> These sentiments he maintained to the last, choosing rather to be driven from his see, and deprived of all the comforts of life, than to abjure opinions which he thought true, or admit opinions which he thought false. He was buried in the place where he died; and his tomb was discovered in the ninth century, with the following epitaph: "Here rests in peace, Julian, a catholic bishop." From this epitaph some have concluded that he renounced at last the Pelagian doctrine, and died a good catholic. But they were not, it seems, aware that the Pelagians constantly styled themselves catholics, stigmatizing St. Austin, and the rest who opposed them, with the name of Manichees.

Julian is supposed to have dissented in some points from Pelagius, in those especially

that relate to grace, and thereby to have introduced, or laid down such principles as naturally tended to introduce the Semipelagian doctrine; which may be reduced to the following heads: 1. That when the truth has been sufficiently declared, we may, by our own free will, without the help of preventing grace, begin to believe it; so that the first beginning of our faith cannot be properly called a gift of God, but our own act. 2. That for all other good works grace is necessary, (and here they differed from the Pelagians); but is never denied to a man, who, by the good use of his free will, has begun to believe. Thus, according to them, grace was the reward of faith, and not faith the effect of grace, which was the doctrine of St. Austin. 3. That, by grace preceding our merits, no more can be meant, than the natural grace and bounty of God, given to man in his reason, and the natural faculties of his soul; by the good use of which, he may render himself worthy of the extraordinary grace that is necessary for him to work out his salvation. 4. That the children who die before they attain the years of discretion, are eternally rewarded or punished, according to the good or bad life they would have led, had they attained to the years of discretion. A most impious tenet! making God punish sins with eternal misery that were never committed: yet not quite so impious as that of St. Austin; who, without having recourse to the supposition of crimes foreseen, supposed innocent children to be eternally damned for a crime committed by Adam, if, by the fault of their parents, they were not baptized. Other tenets of the Semipelagians were these: 5. That the notion of election and reprobation, independent on our merits or demerits, is maintaining a fatal necessity, is the bane of all virtue, and serves only to render good men remiss in working out their salvation, and to drive sinners to despair. 6. That the decrees of election and reprobation are posterior to, and in consequence of our good or evil works, as foreseen by God from all eternity. On these two last propositions the Jesuits found their whole system of grace and free will, agreeing therein with the Semipelagians against the Jansenists and St. Austin; though, not daring to contradict the Doctor of Grace, as he is styled, they pretend their doctrine, and not that of the Jansenists, to be the true doctrine of St. Austin; which has occasioned endless disputes and endless volumes. The latter popes have all favored the Semipelagians or Jesuits against the Jansenists and St. Austin; and Clement XI. above all the rest, by his famous bull *Unigenitus*. But the popes who lived nearer those times, especially Gelasius and Hormisda, were all zealous asserters of the doctrines of St. Austin; nay, Hormisda declared the doctrine contained in the books of that father, namely, in those he wrote on predestination and perseverance, to be the doctrine of the catholic church;

<sup>1</sup> Gennad. c. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. & op. imperf. l. 1. c. 68.

<sup>4</sup> Merc. subnot. c. 4. Aug. op. imperf. p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Merc. ib. p. 40.

<sup>6</sup> Paulin. car. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Idem ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 21. et l. 4. c. 11. Mer. Comm. c. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Aug. ep. 106.



Zosimus quarrels with some bishops of Gaul. The occasion of this quarrel.

which was declaring every true catholic to be a predestinarian.<sup>1</sup> For the doctrine of predestination, (as predestination has been since understood by Calvin and his followers), is there laid down in the plainest terms; which so shocked some persons, otherwise eminent for their piety, say Prosper and Hilarius,<sup>2</sup> that they could not help censuring it, as a doctrine repugnant to the sense of the church, and the fathers; nay, as a doctrine, which, were it even true, ought not to be made public, since it was not necessary that men should know it; and if they did, it would render all exhortations to good works vain and useless.<sup>3</sup> But these, say the Jesuits, pretending their system to be the pure doctrine of St. Austin, misunderstood that father, as did Faustus, the famous abbot of Lerins, when he wrote, "That if it be true, that some are predestined to life, and others to destruction, as a certain holy man (St. Austin) has said, we are not born to be judged, but we are judged before we are born; so that there can be no equity in the day of judgment."<sup>4</sup> To speak impartially, it is no easy matter to determine what system St. Austin had formed to himself, with respect to grace, free will, and predestination: for, in one place, he seems to reject and condemn what he had been laboring to prove and establish in another. Hence Julian, whose understanding was far more methodical, used often to quote him against himself, as the Jesuits and Jansenists still do in maintaining their systems, though diametrically opposite, to be entirely agreeable to his doctrine. He was apt to run into extremes, and, in confuting one error, to lay a foundation for many others. Hence, even his greatest admirers are often at a loss how to make him agree either with the church or himself. However, his great knowledge in those days, his extraordinary zeal for what he called the catholic doctrine, and, above all, his heaping daily volumes upon volumes against all who opposed it, so dazzled the understandings of the popes themselves, that, looking upon him as an inspired writer, they suffered him to dictate even to them, as if he had been pope, and they common bishops; as if infallibility had been transferred from Rome to Hippo, and no longer vested in them, but in him.

But to return to Zosimus: as his partiality to Pelagius and Cælestius occasioned a quarrel between him and the African bishops; his partiality to Patroclus, who had usurped the see of Arles, as I have related above,<sup>5</sup> occasioned, in like manner, a quarrel between him and some bishops of Gaul; and from the latter he reaped no more credit or honor, than he had done from the former. It arose on the following occasion: The bishops of Arles and Vienne had been long contending for the me-

ropolitan dignity, and the jurisdiction attending it, over the provinces of Narbonne and Vienne: and the decision of the controversy having been referred, some years before, to a council that was held in Turin, it had been there decreed, that the bishop who should prove his city to be the metropolis of those provinces according to the civil division of the empire, should enjoy the metropolitan dignity, and the privileges annexed to it; but, in the mean time, to avoid any breach of charity, that both should exercise the jurisdiction of a metropolitan over the churches that were nearest to their respective cities.<sup>1</sup> Thus matters continued, till Patroclus repairing to Rome, and there imposing upon Zosimus, who was quite unacquainted with the merits of the cause, prevailed upon him, by flattering his vanity and ambition, to decide, in his favor, the controversy, which had been so long depending. Zosimus censured very severely, as I have observed above, the African bishops, for acting, as he pretended, with too much haste and precipitation, in the case of Cælestius. But, surely, no man ever deserved to be more justly censured, on that score, than himself: for, not to mention the case of Heros and Lazarus, whom he excommunicated and deposed in their absence, and without hearing what they had to plead in their defence, he took upon him to decide the present controversy, which a council had left undetermined, upon the information given him by one of the parties concerned, without hearing the other: for, giving an entire credit to all Patroclus said, or could say, in behalf of himself and his church, he wrote a letter, addressed to all the bishops of Gaul, declaring, that, for the future, he would receive no bishops or ecclesiastics coming to Rome from those provinces, unless they brought with them letters of communion, called "formatæ," from the metropolitan of Arles, and excommunicating those who should transgress this order.<sup>2</sup>(\*) The privilege of granting the "formatæ" was only personal; for Zosimus did not grant it to the see of Arles, but to Patroclus, whom he styles his "holy brother, in consideration of his extraordinary merit." To such a degree had he suffered himself to be imposed upon, by a man, who was the disgrace of his order.<sup>3</sup> In the same letter he vests him as bishop of Arles, with a metropolitan jurisdiction over the province of Vienne and the two provinces of Narbonne, adjudges to his see all the parishes and territories that had ever been subject to the city of Arles, and grants him a full power to decide and finally determine all controversies that should arise in the three above-mentioned provinces, provided they were not of such

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 1531.

<sup>2</sup> Prosp. et Hil. Literæ. ad Aug. l. 7. p. 542. 546.

<sup>3</sup> Prosp. & Hil. ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Vide Sirmond. hist. prædest. c. 1, 2, &c.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 151, 153.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1156.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1567.

(\*) These letters were given, in the primitive times, to travelling ecclesiastics, that their brethren, in the places through which they passed, knowing who they were, and whence they came, might admit them to their communion.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 153.



Zosimus is opposed by the bishops of Gaul; especially by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles. Proculus excommunicated and deposed by Zosimus. But continues to discharge the functions of his office.

consequence as required them to be examined at Rome.<sup>1</sup> The only reason Zosimus alleges for thus exalting the see of Arles to the prejudice of the see of Vienne, is, because Trophimus, the first bishop of Arles, had converted those provinces to the Christian religion. A reason both false and impertinent: false, because Trophimus flourished in the year 250,<sup>2</sup> and the church of Arles was famous as early as the year 177, when they wrote, with their brethren of Lyons, to the faithful in Asia:<sup>3</sup> impertinent, because it was to the dignity of each city, and to nothing else, that the dignity of the sees was owing. Hence the council of Turin wisely adjudged the metropolitan dignity to him who should prove his city to be the civil metropolis, with respect to the contested provinces, as I have observed above. Zosimus, however, wrote a second letter, which he addressed to all the bishops of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, confirming to the see of Arles all the rights and privileges which he had granted in his first, and rejecting, with scorn, the decree of the council of Turin.<sup>4</sup>

The bishops of Gaul, namely, Simplicius of Vienne, Hilarius of Narbonne, and Proculus of Marseilles, amazed and astonished at the temerity of the bishop of Rome, openly refused to acknowledge his authority, or submit to his sentence. Zosimus, highly provoked at the opposition he met with, wrote several threatening letters to Hilarius and Proculus, as if he determined to cut them off from his communion, if they did not yield, and acknowledge Patroclus for their metropolitan. As for Simplicius, he seems to have acted with less vigor on this occasion than the other two; and it was perhaps on that account that he has been sainted. Hilarius too yielded at last, not to the menaces of Zosimus, which he made no account of, but to those of count Constantius, the avowed patron of Patroclus,<sup>5</sup> whom he allowed, on that consideration, to ordain a bishop at Lodeve, within the limits of his province, which was owing him for his metropolitan. But nothing could shake the firmness and constancy of Proculus. Zosimus, thinking he could frighten him into a compliance, began with reproachful language; from reproaches he proceeded to menaces; and from menaces, to summon him to Rome, to answer there for his presuming to ordain bishops in a province (the second, Narbonnese,) that had been adjudged by the apostolic see to the metropolitan of Arles. But Proculus made so little account of his reproaches, menaces, and summons, that I do not even find he returned them an answer. It is at least certain, that he did not obey the summons, and that he continued to exercise the same jurisdiction, which he had exercised before, opposing to the repeated and peremptory orders of Zosimus a canon of the council

of Turin, appointing him metropolitan of the Narbonnensis Secunda.<sup>1</sup> Zosimus, transported with rage in seeing his authority thus slighted, wrote three letters, all dated the 29th of September, 417, namely, one to the people and clergy of the province of Vienne, another to those of the Second Narbonnese, and the third to Patroclus. In the two former he inveighs bitterly against Proculus, and confirms anew to Patroclus the metropolitan dignity and jurisdiction, which have been so unalterably entailed, says he, on the see of Arles, by the decrees of the fathers and councils, that it exceeds even the power and authority of the Roman church to transfer them to, or entail them upon, any other.<sup>2</sup> This was disclaiming, in the plainest terms, the power of dispensing with the canons, which has since proved so beneficial to the apostolic see. And yet Zosimus was acting the whole time in direct opposition to the fourth canon of the council of Nice, vesting, as it was understood by the subsequent councils, the bishop of each metropolis with the metropolitan dignity and jurisdiction over the whole province. Zosimus, in his letter to Patroclus, encourages him to resume and exercise, in spite of Proculus, the metropolitan jurisdiction over the Second Narbonnese, which Proculus had so unjustly invaded and usurped. This Patroclus durst not attempt, though seconded by the whole power of the apostolic see; which wrought the pride, ambition and resentment of Zosimus to such a pitch, that, giving the reins to his passion, he thundered the sentence of excommunication against Proculus, declared him unworthy of, and degraded from, the episcopal dignity, and committing the church of Marseilles to the care of Patroclus, commanded him to exercise there the jurisdiction with which he was vested. The power of the apostolic see was now exhausted, and, what drove Zosimus almost to despair, exhausted to no effect; for Proculus, to show how little regard he paid to the sentence pronounced against him at Rome, ordained a bishop soon after he was acquainted with it. Zosimus, sensible that the authority of his see was here at stake, would not abandon the attempt. He wrote two letters more on the same subject, one to Patroclus, exhorting him to exert, with vigor and severity, the power with which he was vested; and at the same time commanding him to declare, in his name, that he should never be prevailed upon to acknowledge those whom Proculus had ordained. The other letter was to the people, clergy, and magistrates of Marseilles, stirring them up against Proculus, and encouraging them to drive him out, and receive another in his room at the hands of Patroclus. These letters occasioned great disturbances in the church of Marseilles, which was now rent into two opposite parties, some refusing to acknowledge Proculus, and others declaring that they would acknowledge no

<sup>1</sup> Conc. ib. p. 1567—1569. <sup>2</sup> Greg. Tur. hist. Franc.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. l. 1. c. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1668.

<sup>5</sup> Conc. ibid. p. 1581.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. ibid. p. 1155.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1570.



His steadiness in opposing the encroachments of Rome. Zosimus dies. His character. Zosimus sainted by a mistake of Baronius.

other.<sup>1</sup> But, in spite of the utmost efforts of Zosimus, of Patroclus, and their partisans, Proculus still kept his ground, still continued to exercise all episcopal as well as metropolitan functions, as he had formerly done. He thought even the evils attending a schism of a less dangerous tendency than those which he apprehended from the encroachments of the bishops of Rome. Had all the prelates thus stood up in defence of their just rights and privileges against the papal usurpations, the church had never been reduced to that deplorable thralldom, which she groaned under for so many ages. But, alas! there have been in all times but too many Simpliciuses, who, out of a mistaken principle, have chosen rather to yield to an encroaching power, than to raise disturbances, and forego their own ease, by withstanding it; but too many Patrocluses, who, to gratify their own ambition, have prostituted their sacred dignity to the ambitious views of the pope, and raised him, at the expense of their own order, that they might be raised by him in their turn. Proculus, though deposed, excommunicated, calumniated, persecuted by Zosimus and his tools, kept to the last possession of his see; nay, and was acknowledged for lawful bishop of Marseilles, for metropolitan of the Second Narbonnese, not only by the bishops of Gaul, but likewise by those of Africa.<sup>2</sup> He was still alive in 427, when he condemned the monk Leporius for maintaining Christ to have been born man only, but to have deserved, by his good works, to become God.<sup>3</sup> The encomiums bestowed on him by the council of Turin, by St. Jerom, and Tiro Prosper, as I have observed above, are a sufficient confutation of all the calumnies uttered against him by Zosimus, and the rest of his enemies.

The last letters of Zosimus, that is, his letters to Patroclus, and the people of Marseilles, are dated the 5th of March, 418, and he died in the latter end of the same year, on the 26th of December, says Baronius,<sup>4</sup> upon the authority, we may suppose, of some ancient pontifical.(\*)

The distemper which he died of lasted a long time, and was attended with such violent fits, that he was often thought to be dead before he died. It was during his illness that he wrote his last letters; and yet they are no less remarkable than the rest for that fire and vivacity, that strength of expression, and even that elegance and purity of diction, that were

peculiar to him. He was a man of great address in the management of affairs; well knew how to turn every thing to his advantage; and in the several disputes which he engaged in, he forgot nothing that could any ways distress those who opposed him. He was apt to engage too rashly, giving an entire credit to those who, by a servile submission, flattered his ambition; and when he had once engaged in a cause, as he was of a haughty and imperious temper, impatient of control, passionate, headstrong, full of, and elated with, the dignity of the "apostolic see," it required the greatest art and address in his brethren to bring him into their measures, and withhold him from raising fatal divisions in the church. His whole conduct and behavior towards them, the haughty and peremptory style which he assumed in writing to them, sufficiently show that he looked upon them as infinitely below him, as bound to yield a blind obedience to all his commands, and submit, without reply, to all his decisions: and it is not to be doubted but, had he lived longer, and not met with the vigorous opposition which he did from the bishop of Marseilles, he would have made great progress towards reducing his "fellow-ministers" and "fellow-laborers," as they are styled by St. Cyprian, to that state of dependence, not to say slavery, which in the end they have been reduced to by his successors. He was the first who made use of the expression, "for so it has pleased the apostolic see;"<sup>1</sup> an expression which his successors have all adopted, as the language of the highest authority, and such as exempted them from giving any account either of their actions, or of the motives that prompted them so to act. But, to paint Zosimus to the life, we want no other colours than those, which the African bishops, who were but too well acquainted with him, have furnished us with in the letter which they wrote to his successor Boniface. "We hope," say they, "that since it has pleased the Almighty to raise you to the throne of the Roman church, we shall no longer feel the effects of that worldly pride and arrogance, which ought never to have found room in the church of Christ."<sup>2</sup> In the same letter they complain of their having been made to endure such things as it was almost impossible for them to endure, which however they were willing to forget. Hard indeed and tyrannical must the treatment have been, which they met with at the hands of Zosimus, since it could extort from so many venerable prelates a complaint of this nature, and that in a letter to his immediate successor. Zosimus however has been sainted, and is now worshipped by the church of Rome as a great saint, not so much in regard of his own merits, as by a blunder of Baronius in revising and correcting the Roman martyrology. The case is pretty singular, and may not be thought

<sup>1</sup> Conc. ibid. p. 1574. <sup>2</sup> Du Pin, t. 3. p. 827.

<sup>3</sup> Cassian. incar. l. 1. c. 4. <sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 72.

(\*) He is said to have been buried near the body of St. Laurence, on the Tiburtine way, on the 25th or 26th of December, according to Anastasius the Bibliothecarian; (a) but on the 27th, according to an ancient pontifical, which agrees better with the letters of Symmachus concerning the election of his successor Boniface: so that he may have governed one year nine months and eight or nine days, which is the time that Prosper allows him. (b)

(a) Anast. c. 42.

(b) Vide Pontaci not. in chron. Prosp. p. 777.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1567.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1141.



Schism in the church of Rome. Boniface and Eulalius both chosen. The governor of Rome and the emperor favor Eulalius, who takes possession of the church of St. Peter. The friends of Boniface write to the emperor.

quite unworthy of a place here, by reason of the consequences, which every protestant reader may draw from it. In the martyrology of Bede was marked, "St. Zosimus, martyr, who suffered for the confession of the faith." This martyr an ignorant transcriber mistook for the pope of the same name, and, concerned to find so little said of so great a saint, set down all he knew of him. This copy Baronius perused, and, reading there what the transcriber had added of his own, concluded the saint mentioned in that place to be pope Zosimus, and accordingly, upon the supposed authority of Bede, allotted him a place among the other saints in the Roman martyrology. As for his being said to have suffered martyr-

dom for the confession of the faith, Baronius ascribed that to the ignorance of the transcriber, making but one saint out of two, though they lived at so great a distance of time from each other; for the martyr lived in the earliest times, and is mentioned by St. Polycarp, who flourished two hundred years and upwards before the pontificate of Zosimus. To this double blunder of the transcriber and Baronius is Zosimus indebted for the worship and honors that are publicly paid him in the church of Rome. Indeed that church is not more grossly deluded in paying an idolatrous worship to saints, upon the authority of her "infallible guide," than in the objects to whom that worship is paid.(\*)

## BONIFACE, FORTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS THE YOUNGER.]

[Year of Christ, 419.] ZOSIMUS being dead, great disturbances arose about the election of his successor. Eulalius, whom authors distinguish with the title of archdeacon, shutting himself up in the "Lateran" with part of the people, and some presbyters and deacons, was there chosen by them in the room of Zosimus. At the same time a great number of the people, many presbyters, and some bishops, assembling in the church of St. Theodora, named the presbyter Boniface to the vacant see. Both were ordained the same day they were chosen; Boniface, by nine bishops, and in the presence of seventy presbyters; Eulalius, by three bishops only, and in the presence of a very small number of presbyters; but the bishop of Ostia was one of the three; and he claimed, from a custom which had long obtained, the right of ordaining the bishop of Rome. Symmachus, governor of the city, did all that lay in his power to prevent this double election; but, not succeeding therein he immediately despatched an express to the emperor Honorius, then at Ravenna, with a letter dated the 29th of December, 418, acquainting him with what had passed. But his account was not impartial: he represented Eulalius as lawfully chosen, and his competitor as a usurper. Honorius therefore, by a rescript dated the 2d of January, 419, ordered him to persuade Boniface to retire from Rome, to use force, if persuasions did not prevail, and to apprehend and punish the ringleaders of the sedition, if any should be raised on that occasion. With this rescript the emperor despatched Aphrodisius a tribune and notary; and Symmachus, having received it on the 6th of January, sent early next morning his primiscrinus, or first secretary, with an order for Boniface to attend him, and hear what he had to impart to him

in the emperor's name, letting him know, in the mean time, that he must not take upon him to exercise any episcopal functions; for such was the will and pleasure of the emperor. This order Boniface received while he was holding an assembly in the church of St. Paul without the walls; but paid no regard to it; nay, those who attended him, falling upon the secretary, who brought it, treated him very roughly; which Symmachus no sooner knew than he caused the gates of the city to be shut, and kept Boniface out. In the mean time Eulalius, improving to his advantage the absence of his competitor, repaired to the church of St. Peter, took possession of it amidst the loud acclamations of his partisans, and exercised there all episcopal functions.

The avowed partiality of Symmachus for Eulalius left no room to doubt but he had misinformed the emperor. The bishops therefore, with the presbyters and people, who had chosen Boniface, thought it their duty to transmit to him a candid and impartial account of the late transactions: and this they did accordingly, entreating the emperor at the same time to revoke his former order, and to summon both Eulalius and Boniface to court, in order to try their cause there. Their re-

(\*) Bollandus, to saint Zosimus in a more honorable way, supposes him to have once had a place in the martyrology of St. Jerom; and complains of those who have taken the liberty to strike out his name. One would think he had found his name in some copy of that martyrology, or at least heard of it; but he ingenuously owns, that he never found it there himself, nor heard of any who did; adding, that nevertheless he is fully persuaded it was once there, and that he cannot think otherwise; and it is upon his "not being able to think otherwise" that he founds his supposition, his complaints, and the saintship of Zosimus; (a) which is allowing them to have no foundation at all.

(a) Boll. conat. ad chronol. Pont. p. 61, 62.



Who summons a council to decide the controversy. A more full council summoned. Eulalius disobeys the emperor, and is driven from Rome. Boniface indebted to the emperor for his dignity. Boniface applies to the emperor for a law to restrain the ambition of the candidates to the papacy. His law for that purpose. Boniface free from ambition.

quest appeared just; and Honorius, in compliance with it, sent an order to Symmachus, dated the 13th of January, 419, commanding him to suspend the execution of his former order, and to notify to the two competitors, that they, and those who ordained them, must repair to Ravenna, on pain to him who should fail to appear there on the 8th of the ensuing February, of having his election declared null. Several bishops were summoned to attend at the same time, Honorius thinking it proper, that a dispute of that nature should be decided by none but bishops. However, to remove all suspicion of partiality on his side, he would not allow those to sit as judges, who had been any ways concerned in the election or ordination of either of the competitors. The bishops met; but not being able to agree among themselves, Honorius thought the affair of such importance, that he put it off to the 13th of June, with a design to have it decided then in a full council. He wrote accordingly, not only to the bishops of Italy, but to those too of Gaul and Africa, inviting them to the council, and acquainting them with the time and place of its meeting. In the mean while he strictly enjoined both Boniface and Eulalius to keep at a distance from the city, lest their presence should occasion disturbances there. But as Easter approached, he appointed Achilleus, bishop of Spoleti, who was of neither party, to perform the episcopal functions at Rome during that solemnity. This Eulalius could not brook; and therefore returning to Rome, in open defiance of the emperor's orders, he assembled the people, seized on the Lateran, and shutting the doors against Achilleus, performed in that basilic the episcopal functions usual at Easter. The emperor, being acquainted by Symmachus with what had passed, was so provoked at his disobedience and temerity, that, by a rescript dated from Ravenna the 3d of April, and received at Rome on the 8th of the same month, he commanded Symmachus to drive Eulalius from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the disputed see; which was accordingly done. (\*)

Thus was an end put to the schism; thus was Boniface placed on the Roman see, and vested with the papal dignity by the clemency of the emperor, as Largus proconsul of Africa expresses it in his letter to the bishops of that province;<sup>1</sup> and not by the authority of a council consisting of two hundred and fifty-two bishops, which some have brought down from the clouds, without even letting us know where or when they assembled.<sup>2</sup>

(\*) The original copies of the letters from Symmachus to the emperor, and of the emperor's rescripts to Symmachus, giving a full and distinct account of the present schism, are lodged in the Vatican library, and have been thence copied by Baronius. (a)

(a) Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 1—42.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ib. n. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Bar. ib. n. 34. & Baillet. vies de saints, 35 Oct.

All we know of Boniface before his election is, that he was the son of one Jucundus, a presbyter,<sup>1</sup> was stricken in years, well versed in the ecclesiastical laws, of an unblemished character; and, what enhances his merit, chosen against his will. Thus say his friends, in the letter which they wrote in his behalf to the emperor Honorius.<sup>2</sup> His first care, after he found himself in the quiet possession of his see, was to prevent for the future, so far as in him lay, the cabals and intrigues that might be formed at other elections, as they had been at his, to the great disturbance of the city, and scandal of the Christian religion. With this view he wrote to the emperor, entreating him to restrain, by some severe law, the ambition of those who, trusting more to their intrigues than their merit, aspired to a dignity that was due to merit alone. (\*)

The emperor, in compliance with so just a demand, enacted a law, well calculated to prevent effectually the evil complained of, and keep the ambition of the candidates to the papacy within due bounds. For by this law, when two persons were chosen, neither was to hold the dignity, but the people and clergy were to proceed to a new election. This is the first instance, that occurs in history, of princes intermeddling in the election of the pope; an evil, says F. Pagi, which, from small beginnings, grew to such a height as to reflect great shame and disgrace on the Roman church.<sup>3</sup> But it must be observed, that the original evil was the corruption, the violence, and the many disorders which the clergy and people were guilty of in those elections. It was this which, at the request of the pope himself, called on the emperors to interpose their authority, as the only adequate remedy to such abuses. The succeeding emperors followed the example of Honorius, and the Gothic as well as the Lombard kings, the example of the emperors, as we shall see in the sequel of the present history.

Boniface was naturally a lover of peace, and an enemy to all strife and contention. He did not claim, nor attempt to usurp, any new power over his colleagues; but yet he would not part with any his predecessors enjoyed, by what means soever they had acquired it; and those who attempted to curtail the usurped jurisdiction of the apostolic see, met with as vigorous an opposition from him as they could have done either from Innocent or Zosimus. In short, he had not ambition enough to enlarge his authority, but thought himself in conscience obliged "to maintain the just rights," as he styled and believed them, "of the see in which it had pleased Divine Providence to place him, though unworthy of so great

<sup>1</sup> Platina in Bon. <sup>2</sup> Apud. Bar. ann. 419. n. 8.

(\*) This letter bears date the first of July, 419.

<sup>3</sup> Pagi, crit. hist. in annal. Bar.



Dispute between him and the bishops of Illyricum. Law of Theodosius concerning disputes that arise in Illyricum. Three letters of Boniface. He maintains, with authority, his pretended rights. He revokes the privileges granted by Zosimus to the church of Arles.

an honor." His steadiness in asserting these claims appeared chiefly in the dispute that arose between him and the bishops of Illyricum, over whom Damasus had usurped, as I have related elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> and his successors maintained a particular power and jurisdiction. The transaction is thus related by the writers of those times. The see of Patræ in Achaia, one of the provinces of Illyricum, being vacant, the bishop of Corinth, metropolitan of that province, did all that lay in his power to get Perigenes, a presbyter of an unexceptionable character, chosen in the room of their deceased bishop. But his endeavors proving unsuccessful, he returned to Corinth, and died soon after. Upon his death, the people and clergy of Corinth, to honor his memory, and show the regard they had for one whom he had favored, unanimously named Perigenes to succeed him. But as they apprehended some opposition from the bishops of the same province, they wrote to Boniface, begging him to confirm their election with his authority. Boniface referred them to Rufus, then bishop of Thessalonica, and his vicar in those parts, declaring that, as for himself, he had nothing to object either against their election, or the person elected. Rufus notified to the bishops of the province, and the metropolitans of the diocess, the approbation of Boniface, and his own; but it was not received by all in the same manner. The greater part indeed agreed to the ordination of the new bishop; but some opposed it with great warmth, prompted, most probably, by the jealousy they entertained of the growing power of the see of Rome: for, at their request, a law was published by the emperor Theodosius, dated the 14th of July, 421, commanding all disputes, that should arise in the diocess of Illyricum, to be finally determined by the bishops of that diocess, after they had consulted the bishop of Constantinople.<sup>2</sup> This was taking those provinces from the bishop of Rome, and, in some degree, subjecting them to the bishop of Constantinople, or at least opening a door for such a subjection. The power of the bishops of Constantinople was already grown very considerable, and their ambition keeping pace with that of the bishops of Rome, neither let any opportunity slip of extending the jurisdiction of their own see at the expense of the other. In the present case the bishop of Constantinople, availing himself of the favor of the emperor, and the disagreement that reigned among the Illyricum bishops, summoned, without loss of time, a council to meet at Corinth, and there to examine the ordination of Perigenes, though he had been ordained, and his ordination approved of both by Rufus and Boniface. This step, quite unexpected, alarmed Boniface; he divested himself at once of his pacific dispo-

sition, and, assuming the air and style of authority, he wrote three letters, all dated the same day, namely, 11th of March, 422, encouraging the friends of the apostolic see to maintain its rights, and threatening those who dared to invade them. The first was to Rufus of Thessalonica, whom he animates not to suffer any innovations, but vigorously to withstand those, who assumed an authority that did not become them, and to which they had no kind of title or claim, meaning, no doubt, the bishop of Constantinople. The second letter he wrote to the bishops of Thessaly, exhorting them to acknowledge the authority of Rufus, and no other. The third was addressed to the bishops of Macedon, Achaia, Thessaly, Epirus, and Dacia, who had been summoned by the bishop of Constantinople to assemble at Corinth, and there deliver their opinion concerning the ordination of Perigenes. In this letter he complains, in the strongest terms, of so bold and daring an attempt, asking, in the style of a sovereign, "What bishop shall presume to question an ordination approved by us? What bishop could take upon him to assemble a council with that view and intent? Read," he adds, "read the canons, and there you will find, that the see of Rome is the first, the see of Alexandria the second, and that of Antioch the third. These are the three great sees; these the sees which the fathers have distinguished above the rest, with ample privileges, and extensive jurisdiction." Since he refers them to the canons to show, that these three sees are superior to the see of Constantinople, both in dignity and jurisdiction, it were to be wished he had, at the same time, acquainted them by what canons his predecessors had exercised over the provinces of Illyricum the jurisdiction which he now so zealously asserts. But that is more than it was in his power to do. However, in the present letter, he threatens with excommunication such of the Illyrican bishops as shall, in defiance of his orders, comply with the summons which they have received, or presume to question the ordination of Perigenes. What was the issue of this dispute is not recorded by any of the ancients; but a modern historian<sup>1</sup> informs us, that the emperor Honorius interposing, at the request of Boniface, in behalf of the see of Rome, prevailed upon Theodosius to revoke his former law, and enact another in its room, confirming to the apostolic see all its ancient privileges, and enjoining the præfectus prætori to see the latter law put in execution. The historian quotes this law from the archives of the Roman church. But as it is not to be found either in the Theodosian or the Justinian code, its authenticity may be justly suspected.

The same year 422, Boniface gave a signal instance of his equity and love of justice, which redounds greatly to his honor, and

<sup>1</sup> See p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. Theod. l. 45. de. Episcop. l. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Fleury hist. eccles. l. 24. n. 31.



Boniface revokes the privileges granted by Zosimus to the church of Arles. A remarkable instance of his moderation. His death.

therefore ought not to be omitted. He was sensible, that his predecessor Zosimus, abusing his authority, had acted in the affair of the Gallican bishops, in a most partial and arbitrary manner; that the see of Arles had no just title to the many privileges, which he had been induced, by his partiality for Patroclus, to heap on it, at the expense of two other sees; and, consequently, that it was incumbent upon himself, now that he had the power in his hands, to rectify by a better use of it, what his predecessor had done amiss. The love of justice therefore prevailing in him over all other considerations, he annulled, by a letter addressed to Hilarius of Narbonne, whatever had been done by Zosimus in favor of the see of Arles, restored and confirmed to the sees of Narbonne and Vienne all the rights and privileges, which they had been so unjustly divested of, and declaring all the grants and concessions made to the see of Arles repugnant to the canons, strictly enjoined the bishop of Narbonne not to suffer his brother of Arles to exercise, in virtue of them, any kind of authority within the limits of his jurisdiction.(\*). The conduct of Boniface was afterwards approved, and that of Zosimus justly condemned, by pope Leo the Great, declaring in a letter which he wrote to the bishops of the province of Vienne, that the privileges, which the apostolic see had granted to Patroclus, were afterwards revoked by a more equitable sentence.

One of the many artifices, employed by the popes to aggrandize their see, was to raise divisions among their colleagues, or to foment underhand those that others had raised. For in such divisions they never stood neuter, but, taking part in the quarrel, nay, and making themselves principals, they warmly declared in favor of one party against the other, that, by supporting them, they might be in their turn supported by them in all their pretensions. To this worldly wisdom, this wicked policy, Boniface was an utter stranger: for he did not lay hold of a very favorable opportunity, which the division, that reigned at this time among the bishops of Gaul, offered him, to improve his authority, and extend his jurisdiction. The metropolitan dignity was disputed there by the bishops of Vienne, of Narbonne, and of Arles, as I have observed above. During that contest the clergy of Valence, quarrelling with their bishop Maximus, charged him with several crimes; but not caring to accuse him at the tribunal of any of the three competitors (for that had been acknowledging, in one of the three, the metropolitan jurisdiction then in dispute), they

arraigned him at Rome, and summoned him to plead his cause there before Boniface. Most other popes would have eagerly embraced such an opportunity of enlarging their power; nay, and founded upon this particular case the general right of judging, and finally determining, all causes of the like nature. But Boniface declared, in his letter to Patroclus, and the other bishops of the seven provinces of Gaul, that though Maximus had been accused at his tribunal, though he had not appeared to clear himself from the crimes laid to his charge, and might thereupon be thought guilty, and be justly condemned; yet he would not take upon him to pronounce such a sentence, because that bishop "ought, according to the canons, to be judged and condemned, or absolved, in his own province." An instance of moderation that reflects no small honor on the memory of Boniface; the rather as he had before his eyes the recent examples of Innocent and Zosimus, the two most ambitious and arrogant popes the church had yet seen. He closes his letter with exhorting the bishops of the seven provinces to assemble against the first of November, that Maximus may be cleared, if innocent, or condemned, if guilty.

Boniface died on the 4th of November, 422, having held the chair three years, nine months, and some days. He was buried in the cemetery of the martyr St. Felicitas, on the Salarian way; where he is said to have built an oratory. He is worshipped by the church of Rome among her saints, an honor which few of his predecessors better deserved. But it is a wonder that the last instance I have given of his moderation, and regard to the canons against the claims of his see, did not exclude him out of the calendar. His festival is kept on the 25th of October; and Bede quotes a Book of Miracles wrought by pope Boniface;<sup>1</sup> but whether by the first pope of that name, or the second, he does not inform us, though he seems to give an entire credit to every idle tale that legend contained. And here I cannot help observing, by the way, that the less necessary miracles became, the more they were multiplied. In Bede's time, and the three preceding centuries, men were rather inclined to believe too much than too little; and yet in no other time was there a greater profusion of miracles. From an ancient epitaph quoted by Baronius,<sup>2</sup> it appears that Boniface died very old; that he had served the church from his tender years; that by his engaging behavior he put an end to the schism, and that he relieved Rome in the time of a famine.

(\*) This letter is dated the 2d of February, 422.

<sup>1</sup> Bed. in collectan. in fin. <sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann. 423. n. 8, 9.



Celestine chosen without opposition. Antony, one of St. Austin's disciples, appointed by his interest bishop of Fussala. Antony's scandalous behavior. He is deprived of the administration, and all jurisdiction, by a council. He appeals to Rome. Prevails upon the primate to write in his behalf to Rome. How received by Boniface.

## CELESTINE, FORTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[HONORIUS, THEODOSIUS II., VALENTINIAN III.]

[Year of Christ 422.] UPON the demise of Boniface, Celestine was chosen in his room, without the least disturbance or opposition. Eulalius indeed, who was still alive, and led a retired life in the neighboring province of Campania, was tempted by his friends in Rome to try his fortune a second time, but he did not choose to quit his solitude, and involve both himself and them in new troubles. Celestine was a native of Rome, the son of one Priscus, and a deacon, if not a presbyter, at the time of his election.<sup>1</sup>

He was scarce warm in the chair, when he received a letter from St. Austin on the following occasion. As the small town, or rather village of Fussala, belonging to the bishopric of Hippos, the see of St. Austin, stood at a great distance from that city, the good bishop thought he could not better consult the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants, who had but very lately abandoned the party of the Donatists, than by causing their town to be erected into a separate bishopric, and letting them have a bishop of their own. This was indeed abridging both his own jurisdiction and revenues; but as he had the good of the people more at heart than either, he pursued his scheme with success, and prevailed upon his colleagues in Numidia to ordain a young man named Antony, whom he had brought up from his infancy, the first bishop of the place, though at that time only a reader. This promotion, *per saltum*, as it is styled, was strictly forbidden by the popes in their decretals; but to their orders St. Austin paid no greater regard than the other bishops did, though he always spoke of them, and to them, with all the respect that was due to the first bishop in the west. St. Austin had soon occasion to repent his transgressing those regulations, which, it must be owned, are in themselves very wise: for Antony, who was but a youth, and had been kept by St. Austin under great restraint, no sooner found himself free from all control, than abandoning himself to the indulgence of his youthful passions, he thereby scandalized the new catholics to such a degree, that they let St. Austin know the conduct of their bishop, unless he was quickly removed, would certainly drive them to the last extremity; meaning, perhaps, that they should be forced either to put him to death, or to join anew the Donatists, whom they had but lately forsaken. Such menaces alarmed St. Austin no less than the conduct of his favorite disciple surprised

him. A council was immediately summoned at his request, by the primate of Numidia; Antony was ordered to attend it, and the inhabitants of Fussala invited to lay their complaints before the assembly. The summons was complied with by all, and Antony, by a great number of witnesses, convicted of rapine, violence, and extortion. But, because some capital crimes laid to his charge were not sufficiently proved, the fathers of the council, out of an unseasonable compassion, contented themselves with only condemning him to restore to the inhabitants of Fussala what he had with violence taken from them. They were even inclined to leave him in the quiet possession of his church; but that being warmly opposed by the people, they deprived him of the administration, and of all jurisdiction; but as he still retained the episcopal dignity, they did not choose to remove him to another city to live there even as a private person, lest they should be thought to transgress the rules of the fathers forbidding translations.<sup>1</sup> None could think so who were the least acquainted with those rules.

Antony satisfied, pursuant to his sentence, the inhabitants of Fussala, whom he had wronged. But pretending that he had been unjustly deprived of his bishopric, he resolved to appeal to Rome. He was sensible that his appealing at this juncture, when the point of appeals was warmly disputed, as I shall relate hereafter, was merit enough to recommend him to the favor of that see. However, not trusting to that alone, as Boniface was still alive, he first engaged in his favor his own primate, the primate of Numidia, who, having been excused on account of his great age from assisting at the council, was not well acquainted with what had passed there. Him therefore he easily persuaded, that he had been very ill used by the council: "For had they thought me guilty, (said he,) of the rapine and extortions, that were laid to my charge, they ought, and, without all doubt, would have deposed me: they have not deposed me; and therefore did not, as is manifest, think me guilty. If I did not deserve to be degraded from my dignity, I did not deserve to be driven from my see." Thus he artfully turned the mercy that had been shown him against those who had shown it; and, having by that means imposed upon the primate, persuaded him to write a letter in his behalf to Boniface. With this letter he repaired to Rome, but did not meet there with

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Noris hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 10.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. ep. 261. de civ. Dei. l. 22. c. 8.



The people of Fussala write against Antony to Celestine. Are seconded by St. Austin. Celestine acquiesces in the sentence of the council of Numidia. An end put to the schism formed by Eulalius. Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca, appeals to Rome. Zosimus restores him to the rank from which he had been degraded. To support his pretensions, endeavors to impose upon the African bishops the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice.

the reception he expected: for all he could obtain of Boniface was a letter to the bishops of Numidia, requiring them to reinstate him in his see, "provided he had represented matters as they truly were." This conditional request Antony, on his return to Africa, improved, it seems, into an absolute command: for he threatened the people of Fussala with a visit from the imperial troops and commissaries, if they did not receive him as their lawful bishop, in compliance with the orders of the apostolic see.<sup>1</sup> In the mean time Boniface dying, and Celestine being chosen in his room, the people of Fussala apprehending, as St. Austin writes, greater evils from a catholic bishop, after their return to the church, than they had done from a catholic emperor during their separation, wrote a most pathetic letter to the new pope, entreating him to pity their condition, to curb Antony in his unchristian attempts, and to redeem them, by his authority, from the calamities which they had reason to apprehend from that prelate's cruelty and ambition. In the same letter they imputed all their misfortunes to Austin, who had set over them such a bishop. And this Austin was so far from taking amiss, that he owned the charge, and even backed their request with a letter of his own, conjuring Celestine by the memory of St. Peter, who abhorred all violence and tyranny, not to use either with the people of Fussala, who, he said, had but too much reason not to submit tamely to the galling yoke from which they had been so lately delivered. He adds, that if, in spite of all his endeavors and remonstrances, he should still have the mortification to see the church of Fussala plundered and tyrannically oppressed by one whom he had raised to that see, he should think himself obliged to atone for the share which he had in his crimes, by resigning his own.<sup>2</sup> Celestine was so affected with these letters, that he immediately acquiesced in the sentence of the council of Numidia; and the new bishopric of Fussala being suppressed, that town, with its district, was again subjected to the see of Hippo. From these letters, that were written by the Africans on this occasion, it appears, that the bishops of Rome used, in those days, to send some of their ecclesiastics into Africa, to see the sentences, which they had given, executed there; and that those ecclesiastics came with orders from the court for the civil magistrates to assist them, where their assistance should be required, or thought necessary.

The schism formed by Eulalius was not, it seems, yet quite extinct in Rome in the year 425, for I find a law of that year, dated the 17th of July, and addressed to Faustus, prefect of the city, commanding all Manichees,

heretics, schismatics, and sects of every denomination, to be driven out of Rome; but more especially those, who, separating themselves from the communion of the venerable pope, kept alive a dangerous schism. Over these Faustus enjoined to keep a watchful eye, to summon them to communicate with Celestine, and, if they did not comply with the summons in twenty days, to banish them a hundred miles from Rome.<sup>1</sup> This law was issued by Placidia, who, upon the death of her brother Honorius, which happened in the month of August, 423, and that of the usurper John, killed in 425, governed the western empire, as guardian to her son Valentinian III. The law she issued, probably put an end to the schism; for no further mention is made of it by any historian.

It was in the time of Celestine, and the following year, 426, the fourth of his pontificate, that the bishops of Africa, quite tired out with the daily encroachments of the bishops of Rome, and not able to brook the despotic and arbitrary power which they had begun to exercise over them, took the no less laudable than necessary resolution of breaking their chains before they were thoroughly riveted, and asserting their ancient liberty, by effectually removing what had endangered it, the pernicious abuse of appealing to Rome. The incident, which gave occasion to that resolution, was the appeal of a presbyter of Sicca, named Apiarius, who, being convicted of many crimes, and thereupon degraded and excommunicated by his own bishop, Urbanus, appealed to Zosimus, then bishop of Rome. Zosimus, who missed no opportunity of acquiring new power, or improving the power which he had acquired, not only received the appeal, but, without ever hearing the other side, restored Apiarius both to his rank, and the communion of the church. This was the boldest attempt that had yet been made upon the rights and liberties of the African churches; and therefore the bishops in those parts, all uniting in a cause that was common to all, loudly complained of such an arbitrary act, as an open violation of the canons of the church, forbidding those, who had been excluded from the communion by their own bishop, to be admitted to it by any other.<sup>2</sup> Zosimus, finding the African bishops had taken the alarm, and were determined to restrain his power within the limits prescribed to it by the canons, and, on the other hand, being well apprised, that he could allege no canons, that had ever been received by them, to countenance the power which he claimed, and had exercised, thought it would be no great crime to recur to fraud on so urgent an occasion. Agreeably to this scheme, he caused two ca-

<sup>1</sup> Aug. ep. 261.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1048. Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 60.



With this view he sends a solemn embassy into Africa. The surprise of the African bishops on this occasion. A general council assembled at Carthage. The conduct of Faustinus, the pope's legate, on this occasion. The resolution taken by the council.

nons to be transcribed from the council of Sardica; the one allowing presbyters and deacons, when rashly excommunicated by their own bishops, to appeal to the neighboring bishops; and the other, authorizing the appeal of all bishops to the bishop of Rome. Had the Africans received these canons, he intended to have justified, by the former, his judging and absolving Apiarius, notwithstanding the distance between Rome and Numidia; and, in virtue of the latter, to get the canon revoked, which the African bishops had lately made, forbidding, on pain of excommunication, appeals beyond sea; that is, to Rome. Nothing less than an entire subjection of the African churches to the see of Rome would satisfy the boundless ambition of Zosimus; and such a subjection would infallibly have ensued, had the two above-mentioned canons been received by the African bishops in the sense which Zosimus did, and seemed determined to make others, put upon them. But the main point was, to persuade the bishops of Africa to admit such canons, especially at so critical a juncture. The council of Sardica had never been received there: nay, they were, it seems, at this very time, utter strangers both to that council and its canons; so that it was useless to quote them as such. Of this Zosimus was aware; and therefore, as he stuck at nothing that stood in the way of his ambition, he resolved, by one of the most impudent and barefaced impostures recorded in history, to try whether he could not impose upon the bishops of Africa the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice. With this knavish view, and to render the imposture more solemn, and less suspected, he despatched into Africa three legates, namely, Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, in Picenum, and two Roman presbyters, Philippus and Asellus. Their instructions, contained in a letter addressed to themselves, were, to require of the African bishops a strict observance of the two above-mentioned canons of Nice; to complain of their repairing so often to court; and to desire them not to communicate with Urbanus of Sicca, who had deposed Apiarius, or even to send him to Rome, if he refused to correct what he had done amiss:<sup>1</sup> that is, we may suppose, if he did not restore Apiarius to his rank, and the communion of the church.

With these instructions the legates set out for Africa, where they no sooner arrived, than a council was convened, at which assisted, among the rest, Alypius, bishop of Tagaste, St. Austin's great friend, and Aurelius, bishop of Carthage. When the legates first appeared before the council, the bishops desired them to lay their instructions before the assembly; which they were at first unwilling to do, contenting themselves with declaring

their commission by word of mouth. But the Africans knowing whom they had to deal with, and thereupon pressing them to communicate their instructions in writing, they complied at last, and produced the letter I have mentioned above, which was immediately registered. When it was publicly read, it is impossible to conceive the surprise and astonishment that appeared in the whole assembly. They had never heard of those canons; and to find them thus confidently ascribed to the council of Nice, was what appeared to them strange beyond expression. Warm disputes arose, of which, however, we know no particulars. Several different Greek copies, several Latin copies, were sent for, and carefully examined and compared; but no such canons could be found there. However, as the legates continued to maintain, with an unparalleled impudence, the disputed canons of Nice, the council agreed to observe them, till they had, by a more diligent inquiry, discovered the truth.<sup>1</sup>

They continued their sessions; but as they were few in number, as the point in dispute was of the utmost consequence, and nearly affected all the bishops of Africa, they thought it should be communicated to all; and that, without the concurrence of all, no resolution should be taken. A general council was accordingly assembled at Carthage, consisting of two hundred and seventeen bishops, from the different provinces of Africa. They met, for the first time, on the 25th of May, 419. Faustinus being placed next after Aurelius of Carthage, and Valentine, primate of Numidia, and the two presbyters, Philippus and Asellus, after the other bishops. Being all seated, Aurelius moved that the canons of Nice might be read, from the copies which they had of that council in Africa. But this was warmly opposed by Faustinus, insisting upon their reading, in the first place, his instructions, and coming to some resolution concerning the observance of the canons of Nice, which he was charged by the apostolic see to require of them. "It matters not," said he, "whether or not those canons are to be found in your copies, or, indeed, in any other. You must know, that the canons and ordinances of Nice, which have been handed down to us by tradition, and established by custom, are no less binding than those that have been conveyed to us in writing." To this speech the bishops returned no answer; without doubt, because they thought it deserved none. However, at his request, his instructions were read, and warm debates ensued. Alypius was of opinion, that since the disputed canons were not to be found in any of their copies, messengers and letters should be immediately despatched to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1137—1144.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1144—1148.



The affair of Apiarius, how settled by the council. The African bishops write into the east for authentic copies of the council of Nice. The pretended canons not found in those copies, and the dispute dropped by Boniface. The power of receiving appeals claimed by the popes only as granted by the canons.

Antioch, for authentic copies of the acts and canons of Nice. This proposal Faustinus highly resented, as an outrage offered to the apostolic see, which, he said, was thereby arraigned of fraud and forgery. He therefore advised them to write to Boniface, who, by this time, had succeeded Zosimus, and, leaving to him the care of examining the authority of those canons, submit the whole to his judgment, to his known prudence and discretion. He added, that by acting otherwise, they might give occasion to great divisions and disturbances in the church. Aurelius, not to exasperate the legate, whom he found to be a man of a haughty, imperious, and intractable temper, made no other reply, but that they would write to Boniface. St. Austin promised to observe those canons so long as it could be reasonably supposed that they were the canons of Nice. The other bishops made the same promise; which was confirming the resolution the council had taken the year before. Here the legate exaggerated anew the affront they offered to the Roman church; adding, that the only reparation they could make, for questioning the authenticity of canons proposed by her, was to leave the deciding of that point to her, and acquiesce in her judgment. But the warmth, the earnestness, the passion which he betrayed in his speech, and in his whole conduct, served only to heighten the jealousy, and confirm the suspicions, of the African bishops. It was therefore universally agreed, in spite of the remonstrances, entreaties, and menaces of the legate, that Aurelius should write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, for authentic copies of the canons of Nice: that if the canons, quoted by Faustinus, were found in those copies, they should be punctually observed; if not, that a new council should be convened, and such resolutions taken, as the fathers who composed it, should think proper<sup>1</sup>.

Matters being thus settled, with respect to the pretended canons of Nice, concerning appeals, the council took next into consideration the case of Apiarius, which had given occasion to the present dispute between Rome and Africa; and it was agreed, that Apiarius should make the due submission to his bishop, and thereupon be readmitted to his communion, and restored to his rank. However, as he had given great offence to the people of Sicca, by his scandalous life, he was ordered, by the council, to quit that city; but, at the same time, allowed to exercise the functions of his office in any other place.<sup>2</sup> This medium the council wisely chose between the two opposite sentences; that of Urbanus excommunicating and deposing him, and that of Zosimus restoring him to the communion and the priesthood. Such was the

issue of the appeal of Apiarius: and I leave the reader to judge, whether Baronius should boast of it as he does. And now nothing remained, but to acquaint Boniface with the acts and resolutions of the council; and this was done accordingly by a letter, which they all signed, and delivered to the legates. In that letter they begged Boniface to procure, from the east, authentic copies of the canons of Nice, promising to observe the canons in dispute, till such copies were procured; but this upon condition, that if those canons were not found to be genuine, they should recover their ancient privileges, and not be forced to "submit to a yoke, which ambition alone could impose."<sup>1</sup>

With this letter the three legates set out from Africa, on their return to Rome. Upon their departure, the African bishops wrote, agreeably to the resolution they had taken, to Atticus of Constantinople, and Cyril of Alexandria, begging they would cause to be transcribed, and sent into Africa, the most authentic copies they had of the canons of Nice. With this request the two bishops readily complied; and the same year, 419, the messengers sent to Alexandria and Constantinople returned with the wished for copies, and very friendly and obliging answers, which are still extant,<sup>2</sup> from Cyril and Atticus, addressed "to Aurelius, to Valentine, and to all the bishops of Africa assembled at Carthage." As for the bishop of Antioch, the Africans probably did not write to him; at least, they had no answer from him.(\*). They immediately compared the two copies, sent them from the east, with their own, especially with that which Cæcilianus of Carthage had brought with him from Nice, where he had assisted at the council; and found them agree in every particular, without any trace of the canons that Zosimus had produced: upon which they despatched the same ecclesiastics with them to Rome, whom they had sent into the east. Boniface, who was an enemy to all fraud and imposition, acquiesced; the dispute was dropped; so that the canon, which the African bishops had lately made, forbidding appeals to Rome, and Zosimus had thus fraudulently attempted to defeat, remained in its full vigor; and the churches of Africa were suffered quietly to enjoy their ancient rights and privileges, so long as Boniface lived. But in the pontificate of his successor Celestine, the storm broke out anew.

It may not be improper here to observe, that Zosimus, though wholly bent on exalting his see, and straining every prerogative to the highest pitch, yet did not presume to exalt it above the canons; did not claim the

<sup>1</sup> Conc. t. 2. p. 1145—1149.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1137—1145.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 1137—1141.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. t. 2. p. 1144.

(\*) It is very observable, that the Alexandrian copy was originally sent from Rome by Marcus, bishop of that city, upon a complaint made by the Egyptian bishops, that the Arians had burnt all the copies of the council of Nice that were then found in Alexandria.



Whether Zosimus ignorantly mistook the canons of Sardica for those of Nice. Apiarius excommunicated anew. He appeals again to Rome, and is restored by Celestine, and sent back attended by the legate Faustinus. A general council assembled. Apiarius appears before it, with Faustinus.

disputed power of receiving appeals, of judging, deciding, &c. independently of the canons. And was not this owning himself, but for the canons, to be upon the level with the other bishops his colleagues; at least in respect to this point? Is not the scandalous method which he took on this occasion to extend his own power, and curtail that of the African bishops, a demonstration of his deriving his claim from the canons alone? Could there ever offer a better opportunity, could there ever occur a more urgent necessity, of asserting a "divine right?" As Zosimus therefore never asserted, nor even mentioned, such a right, we may well conclude, that he either had no notion of it, or did not think it sufficiently grounded to be of any use in the present dispute. And yet this "divine right" of receiving appeals from all parts of the world, of constituting, confirming, judging, censuring, suspending, deposing, removing, restoring bishops, and all other ecclesiastics, is now held, as an article of faith, by all true Roman catholics; insomuch that to dispute such an article, would be no less dangerous, in countries where the inquisition prevails, than to dispute any article of the apostolic or Nicene creed. It is true, Innocent the First, as the advocates for the see of Rome observe, had claimed, by "divine right," the power of finally deciding all controversies. But he himself seems to have been sensible that he had gone too far, for what else could have induced him to restrain that claim, as soon as he had set it up, to "matters of faith alone?"<sup>1</sup> Had Zosimus thought the general claim capable of being maintained, he need not have recurred, as he did, to fraud and imposture. The pretensions of Innocent, in their utmost extent, were indeed renewed, in process of time, by his successors; but not till the intolerable abuse, which they made of the power granted them by the canons of Sardica, on which they founded all their usurpations, obliged other councils to revoke those canons; and then it was, that, no other means being left of maintaining their ill-gotten power, they revived the claim of Innocent, and, challenging no longer by the canons, but by "divine right," the prerogative of receiving appeals, they put it out of the power of all future councils to abridge or restrain it.

The three cardinals, Baronius, Bellarmine, and Noris, thinking the imputation of ignorance less injurious to the memory of Zosimus, less derogatory to the dignity of the apostolic see, than that of fraud and imposture, suppose him to have ignorantly mistaken the canons of Sardica for the canons of Nice; which is supposing, that in the whole archives of the Roman church there was not a single genuine copy of the council of Nice, or that Zosimus had never perused it; and to suppose either

is highly absurd. Besides, the whole conduct of the legate, the pains he took to divert the African bishops from consulting other copies, and, when he could not prevail, his recurring to "unwritten" canons; and, as that too proved ineffectual, his striving by all possible means to persuade the Africans to leave to the pope the care of examining other copies, and to acquiesce, without any further inquiry, in what should thereupon be determined by him, plainly shows, that the legate was privy to the fraud, and apprehended a detection.

Apiarius, being obliged to quit Sicca, as I have related above, retired to Tabraca, another city of Numidia, and led there so scandalous a life, that he was excommunicated anew. Hereupon he appealed again to Rome, and Celestine, which is very surprising, notwithstanding the vigorous opposition which his predecessors had, but very lately, met with from the African bishops, in attempting to restore this very presbyter, not only declared him innocent, and admitted him to his communion, but sent him back into Africa, attended by the legate Faustinus, who was ordered to see him reinstated. The Africans were but too well acquainted already with the presumption and arrogance of the bishops of Rome; and yet such an insolent act quite surprised them. For Celestine had neither examined the crimes, which Apiarius was charged with, nor heard the witnesses, nor even condescended to let them know, that he intended to judge him anew.

He wrote, indeed, two letters to them on this occasion, but which seemed merely designed to insult them: for, by the first, he gave them notice of the arrival of Apiarius at Rome, which, he said, had given him great joy; and by the second, which was brought by Faustinus, he acquainted them that he was overjoyed to have found him innocent. From this despotic and extraordinary way of acting, the African bishops concluded, that Celestine was determined to keep no measures with them, and that nothing less than an entire subjection of the African churches to the see of Rome would satisfy his ambition. But they were resolved to maintain, at all events, the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. A general council was therefore assembled, and Apiarius summoned to attend. He obeyed the summons, and appeared before the council at the time appointed, but in company with Faustinus, showing thereby, that he placed greater confidence in him than in his own innocence. Faustinus spoke first, and pressed, with great warmth, the fathers of the assembly to readmit Apiarius to their communion, since he had been declared innocent by the apostolic see, and admitted by Celestine to the communion of the Roman church. The bishops replied, that in Africa, Apiarius had been found guilty, and that in Africa his innocence must he made to appear, before they could

<sup>1</sup> See p. 156.



The legate's insolent conduct. Apiarius pleads his own cause. Faustinus assists him. Apiarius, struck with sudden remorse, owns the crimes laid to his charge. The African bishops renew the canon forbidding appeals to Rome. Their letter to Celestine.

receive him again to their communion. As they stuck to this point, Faustinus undertook his cause; but, instead of proving, as he had promised to do, or even attempting to prove his innocence, he inveighed, from the beginning of his speech to the end, and in very harsh and opprobrious language, against the council, and all the members, who composed it. Apiarius was sensible, that the speech of Faustinus, instead of reconciling the African bishops to him, had incensed them more than ever against him; and therefore thinking it advisable to take the cause into his own hands, he stood up as soon as the other had done; and, with a modesty capable, as he thought, of atoning for the insolence of Faustinus, endeavored to clear himself from the crimes that had been laid to his charge. When he had spoken, the witnesses against him were heard; and the trial lasted three whole days, Apiarius striving, with great art and subtilty, to invalidate the depositions, and Faustinus prompting him when he was at a stand. He might, perhaps, have escaped condemnation, partly by his own craft and address, partly by the powerful protection of the bishop of Rome, had he been able to withstand the stings of his own conscience. But, on the fourth day, when Faustinus began to triumph as sure of victory, Apiarius, struck with sudden remorse, damped at once all his joy, by voluntarily owning, to the great surprise of all present, and the unspeakable confusion of Faustinus, every crime with which he had been charged. Those crimes the fathers have thought fit to wrap in oblivion; and indeed it was not proper, that posterity should know them; since they were "heinous, incredible, such as ought not to be mentioned, and drew sighs and tears from the whole assembly."<sup>1</sup> And this is the man whom two popes, both now worshipped as saints in the church of Rome, absolved as innocent; and, as innocent, would have supported with force and violence, had not providence almost miraculously interposed, to prevent the evils that would have ensued. They could not but know that Apiarius was guilty; at least they did not know that he was innocent. But as he had been declared guilty in Africa, their declaring him innocent, whether he was so or not, gave them an opportunity of renewing the attempts of the apostolic see on the liberties of the African churches; and it was, no doubt, with this view that they absolved and restored him. But, as he was not hardened enough in iniquity for their purpose, he owned himself guilty, in spite of their judgment declaring him innocent, and thereby defeated their schemes for the present. For the Africans, now sensible that there was no wickedness which the bishops of Rome would not countenance, in order to establish their power

in Africa, to the utter subversion of all ecclesiastical order and discipline there, thought themselves bound, as they tendered the welfare, peace, and tranquillity of the churches committed to their care, to act with that vigor and steadiness, which so urgent an occasion seemed to require. Accordingly they first absolutely cut off Apiarius from the communion of the church; then renewed, in stronger terms than ever, the canon, which had given so great offence at Rome, prohibiting, on pain of excommunication, appeals beyond sea, under any pretence whatsoever; and this prohibition they extended to ecclesiastics of all conditions and ranks. Faustinus blustered, vaped, threatened; but all in vain. The bishops not only signed, all to a man, the above-mentioned canon, but wrote a synodal letter to Celestine, acquainting him with what had passed in the case of Apiarius, and earnestly entreating him not to give ear for the future to those, who should have recourse to him from Africa, nor receive to his communion such as they had excluded from theirs: "For we must let your venerableness (*venerabilitas tua*) know," say they, "that it has been so established by the council of Nice. And though mention is there made of clerks only, and laymen; yet there is no room to doubt but it was their intention, that such a rule should extend to bishops too; and it would be a great irregularity, should your holiness (a title then common to all bishops) over-hastily and unduly admit to your communion bishops, who have been excommunicated in their own provinces. Your holiness therefore must not receive the presbyters, and other clerks, who, to avoid the punishment which they deserve, recur to you; the rather as we know of no constitutions thus derogatory to the authority of our churches; and the council of Nice has subjected the bishops themselves to the judgment of their metropolitan. The fathers of that council have decreed, with great wisdom and equity, that all disputes should be finally determined in the places where they began, being sensible, that the grace of the Holy Spirit, necessary for judging rightly, would not be wanting in any province; especially as every man, who thinks himself injured, may apply for redress, if he pleases, to the synod of his own province, or to a national council. Would it not be presumption in any of us to suppose or imagine, that God will inspire a particular person with the spirit of justice, and refuse it to many bishops assembled in council? And how can a judgment, given out of the country, and beyond sea, be right, where the necessary witnesses cannot be present, by reason of their sex, of their age, or of some other impediment? As for your sending legates, we find no such ordinance in any council, nor in the writings of the fathers. As for what you have sent us by our colleague Faustinus, as a canon of the council of Nice,

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1145—1148.



Celestine declares translations lawful. His letter to the metropolitans of Illyricum.

we must let you know, that no such canon is to be found in the genuine and uncorrupt copies of that council, which have been transcribed and sent us by our fellow-bishop Cyril of Alexandria, and the reverend Atticus of Constantinople. Those copies we sent to Boniface, your predecessor of worthy memory. We therefore earnestly beg you would send no more legates, nor ecclesiastics, to execute your judgments here, lest you should seem to introduce worldly pride and arrogance (*typhum sæculi*) into the church of Christ." They conclude with entreating him not to suffer Faustinus to continue any longer among them.<sup>1</sup> Celestine, finding the spirit with which they acted, and sensible that it would be useless to employ force at this juncture, thought it advisable to acquiesce for the present, and wait till a more favorable opportunity should offer for him, or his successor, to renew the attempt. (\*)

The following year, 427, Sisinius, bishop of Constantinople, being dead, the bishops in those parts were for appointing Proculus in his room. But, as Proculus had been ordained before, though never installed, bishop of Cyzicus, they were under some apprehension, lest his promotion to the see of Constantinople should be deemed a breach of the canons forbidding translations. But Celestine, whom they consulted on this occasion, delivered them from that apprehension, declaring, in a letter, which he wrote at this time to Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, and Rufus of Thessalonica, that they might safely place on one see a bishop named to another; nay, and a bishop who actually governed another;<sup>2</sup> that is, he declared translations lawful.†

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 2. p. 1148, 1149. <sup>2</sup> Socr. l. 7. c. 29.

(\*) Schelstrate would make us believe, that Gregory the Great prevailed upon the African bishops to revoke the canon forbidding the presbyters and inferior clergy to appeal to Rome; (a) and Davidius, that the Africans changed their minds with respect to the appeals of bishops, as soon as they were informed, that such appeals had been allowed, and approved of, by the council of Sardica. (b) But neither alleges any solid reason, or even conjecture, to prove facts of such importance; nay, what Davidius advances is certainly false, since the canons forbidding all appeals to Rome, made at this time, were still quoted among the other canons of the African collection in 825, and confirmed by a council held at Carthage that year. (c) Some pretend that Celestine separated himself on this occasion from the African bishops, and that this separation continued between their churches, and that of Rome, till the beginning of the VIIth century, when Eulalius of Carthage, and his colleagues, desirous of putting an end to the schism, revoked all the canons that had been made in 426, derogatory to the rights of the Roman see. (d) This they advance upon the authority of a piece commonly ascribed to pope Boniface II. But that piece is so evidently supposititious, that Baronius himself is forced to give it up.

† Against translations there may be reasons in policy; but there can be none in conscience; and none that are at all to the purpose, have been alleged either by the councils, or fathers, though the former have exerted all their authority to prevent them, and the

The same year Celestine wrote to Perigenes of Corinth, Donatus, of Nicopolis in Epi-

latter all their oratory to make them appear criminal. The councils of Arles, of Nice, of Alexandria, of Sardica, of Chalcedon, of Antioch, forbid them on the severest penalties the church could inflict. The council of Sardica, by its first canon deprived such bishops, as should change their churches, even of the lay-communication: and because some pleaded, or at least the council apprehended they might plead, the desire and request of the people; to leave no room for such an excuse, the council, by its second canon, deprived those, who should allege it, of the lay-communication, even at the point of death. (a) The council of Alexandria, under St. Athanasius, in their epistle to all the catholic bishops, speak thus of Eusebius, who had been translated from Berytus to Nicomedia: "Eusebius did not reflect on the admonition of the apostle, 'Art thou bound to a wife? do not seek to be loosed. For if it be said of a woman, how much more of a church? to which if one is tied, he ought not to seek another; that he may not be likewise found an adulterer, according to the scripture.'" (b)—What analogy between a wife and a bishopric? The bishops of that assembly were even of opinion, that Eusebius, by abandoning his former church, had annulled his episcopacy. In the synod under Mennas, it was laid to the charge of Anthimus, that being bishop of Trebisonde, he had adulterously seized on the see of Constantinople. (c) In the same strain have the fathers declaimed against translations, whenever an opportunity offered of bringing in that favorite topic; for the canons and decisions of the councils were only the private opinions of the major part of the bishops, who composed them. They generally inveigh against that adulterous traffic, as if they supposed a bishop to be married to the church, which he was ordained to serve, or tied to it by bonds no less indissoluble than a husband to his wife: and it was upon that supposition, that they charged with adultery those who passed from one church to another. But that supposition none of them have been able to make good either from scripture or reason. As for the command of the apostle in his letter to Timothy, "a bishop must be the husband of one wife," which some of them have interpreted as levelled against translations; the far greater part both of the fathers and councils have in that passage understood the word wife, not in a metaphorical, but a natural sense, and thereupon excluded from the episcopal dignity such as had been twice married. But allowing St. Paul to have meant a church by the word wife, the most obvious and natural interpretation we can give to his words is, that he there forbids pluralities of bishoprics, which were once very common in the church of Rome.

But whatever reasons the fathers and councils may have alleged, or could allege, against translations, they have themselves defeated them all by the contrary practice. For some of the greatest saints, and lights of the church, have been either translated, or approved and promoted the translations of others. The famous Methodius, who suffered under Dioclesian in the year 311, or 312, passed from the see of Olympus, in Lycia, to that of Tyre. (d) Eustathius, who is supposed to have presided at the council of Nice, was translated from Bæræa to Antioch: that is, from a small see to the second in the east; (e) nay, Sozomen ascribes this translation to the council of Nice itself. (f) Syderius, bishop of Erythra, in Libya, was translated by Athanasius to Ptolemais, the metropolis of the whole Pentapolis. (g) Euphronius, bishop of Colonia, a small town on the borders of Armenia, was, by a synod, consisting of all the orthodox bishops of that province, translated to the metropolitan see of Nicopolis: that translation was highly applauded by St. Basil, who thought it owing, not to human prudence, but to a particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost; (h) the Arians being very powerful in that city, and no man more fit to make head against them than Euphronius. The inhabitants of Colonia were very unwilling to part with their bishop; and the ecclesiastics there even threatened to join the Arian party, if

(a) Schel. Eccles. Afric. p. 50.

(b) Dav. jugemens Canoniques des Evesques, p. 663, 664.

(c) Concil. t. 4. p. 1636.

(d) Van. Espen. in Can. p. 216.

(a) Concil. t. 2. p. 628. (b) Syn. Alex. apud Athan.

(c) Concil. sub Mem. p. 9. apol. 2.

(d) Hier. vir. ill. c. 83. Socr. l. 6. c. 13.

(e) Theod. l. 1. c. 6. Theoph. Eutyph. & alii.

(f) Soz. l. 1. c. 2. (g) Synes. ep. 67.

(h) Basil. ep. 292.



He complains of several abuses that prevailed in some churches of Gaul. Bishops not distinguished formerly by their dress from the laity.

rus, and Basil, of Larissa in Thessaly, all three metropolitans of Illyricum, recommending to them an entire submission to the see of Rome, and to that of Thessalonica; Rufus, who presided there, having been appointed by him to determine, in his name, all disputes that might arise among them. He lets them know, that, in virtue of the submission, which

Euphronius was taken from them. (a) But they were in the end prevailed upon by St. Basil to acquiesce in the will of God, who, said he, had inspired the prelates with such a resolution. (b) From these (and many other instances might be alleged) it is manifest that the fathers spoke like mere declaimers, when they compared a bishop who left one church, and took another, to a husband, who abandoned his wife, and married another woman. But indeed they only inveighed thus, generally speaking, against translations, when the persons translated were of the party which they opposed; it was then adultery, it was forfeiting the episcopal dignity, to pass from one church to another. But when they apprehended that such changes could any ways promote the cause which they had espoused and maintained, those changes were thereby sanctified, and owing to a particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Pope Gelasius II. excused translations by the example of St. Peter. "Who dares to maintain," says he, "that St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, was to blame for changing the see of Antioch for that of Rome?" (c) And who dares to maintain that any bishop is to blame for doing what the prince of the apostles had done before him? But were there no other instances beside that of St. Peter to give a sanction to translations, I should readily grant them never to have been allowed in the church. For St. Peter never was bishop of Rome, as I have shown already; (d) and some of the reasons, proving him never to have been bishop of Rome, make equally against his pretended episcopacy of Antioch. Most of the ecclesiastical writers, indeed suppose him to have been bishop of Antioch; but St. Luke is quite silent on that head, though within the compass of his history, as Jerom observed; (e) and his silence ought to be of more weight than the authority of writers who lived some ages after. Origen, who flourished in the third century, was the first who mentioned St. Peter's see of Antioch, saying, it was held by Ignatius after him. (f) Origen was copied by Eusebius, and Eusebius by those, who came after him.

On translations, a modern writer of the court of Rome reasons thus:—

"Translations have been severely censured by the fathers, and often condemned both by the popes and the councils. But neither can the councils tie the hands of the popes, nor can one pope tie the hands of another. The power of dispensing with all canonical impediments the popes hold by divine right; which therefore can only be restrained by divine authority. However, translations ought not to be allowed, but on most urgent occasions; and it is in order to prevent them that the popes have adopted the wise regulations of some well governed republics, where certain goods are not prohibited, but loaded with such customs as are next to a prohibition." (g) The canons were made for the good of the church and the people; and therefore cannot be binding when they oppose either. Hence it follows, that there being in such cases no room left for a dispensation, nothing ought in justice to be exacted for it. And yet, let the occasion be ever so urgent, a very considerable sum must be paid into the apostolic chamber for the pretended dispensation. If the occasion is not urgent, they allow the canons to be binding; and what can induce the popes to dispense with them, but that, which one of them taxed those bishops with, who seek translations, avarice, filthy lucre, and an ungodly desire of greater wealth? (h) as if the canons had been made with no other view but to give the popes an opportunity of filling their coffers by granting leave to transgress them.

(a) Id. *ibid.*

(b) Id. *ibid.* & ep. 290. 293.

(c) Gelas. II. ep. 1.

(d) See above, p. 1.

(e) Hier. in Gall. ii.

(f) Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.

(g) Contius de Curia Romana.

(h) Anast. ep. 2.

they owed to the see of Thessalonica, and he required of them, they were to ordain no bishops, assemble no councils, without the knowledge and consent of Rufus; which was restraining to the see of Thessalonica, that is, engrossing to himself (for the bishop of Thessalonica acted only as his vicar), the privileges which the council of Nice had granted to all metropolitans. It is observable, that in this very letter Celestine affects an entire obedience to the canons of the church. "We ought," says he, "to subject our will to the rules, and not the rules to our will; we ought to conform to the canons, and strictly observe what they prescribe."<sup>1</sup> But he did not govern himself by this maxim upon other occasions.

The following year, 428, he wrote a long letter to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne, against several abuses that prevailed in those parts. This letter he begins quite in the style of a modern pope: "As I am, says he, appointed by God to watch over his church, it is incumbent upon me every where to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room; for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored." Thus, under the name of "pastoral vigilance," he extends, at once, his authority and jurisdiction over all the churches of the Christian world. The first abuse he complains of was a particular dress assumed by some bishops, wearing, in imitation of the monks, a cloak and girdle. With this novelty Celestine finds great fault, and exhorts the bishops to distinguish themselves from the people by their doctrine, and not by their garments, by the sanctity of their manners, and not by the mode of their dress, by the internal purity of their souls, and not by the external attire of their bodies. What a large field would the so many different and ridiculous habits of the monks and friars, the costly attire of bishops and cardinals, and, above all, the gorgeous and stately apparel of Celestine's own successors, have opened for his zeal, had he lived in our days! He pleasantly adds, that if they understood, in a literal sense, the words of our Savior, "Let your loins be girded about,"<sup>2</sup> they ought to interpret other passages after the same manner, and never appear without lamps and staves in their hands. And was not this condemning, at least ridiculing, the monkish habits, an essential part of which is the girdle? (\*) The other abuses, which

<sup>1</sup> Coll. Rom. per Holsten. p. 85—87.

<sup>2</sup> Luke. xii. 25.

(\*) From this passage it is manifest, that in those days the bishops, and other ecclesiastics, were not yet distinguished by their dress from the laity, at least when they were not actually discharging the functions of their office. Whether they used, even then, any particular dress or attire, may be justly questioned. Dionysius Exiguus thinks they did not; (a) and F. Sirmond is of the same opinion. For, according to Sirmond, the ecclesiastics used no other dress in the church, but that which they wore daily out of the

(a) Biblioth. Jur. Can. per Justel. t. 1. p. 210.



The Pelagian doctrine prevails in Britain. The Britons recur to the Gallican bishops, who send Germanus and Lupus into Britain. Their journey. Miracles wrought by them on the sea, and after their landing. The whole island reclaimed. Germanus returns anew, and utterly roots out the Pelagian heresy. Beginning of the dispute between Nestorius and St. Cyril.

Celestine wanted to have redressed, have nothing new in them, or that has not been mentioned before in this history; and therefore I omit repeating them here.

About this time the Pelagian doctrine began to prevail, almost universally, in Britain, being preached here either by the natives, who had adhered to their countryman Pelagius abroad, and were returned home, or by others, who, finding themselves, in virtue of the imperial laws, every where persecuted on the continent, had fled to this island for shelter. The leading man of the party here was one Agricola, the son of a British bishop named Severianus.<sup>1</sup> But that Severianus himself, or any of his colleagues, countenanced their doctrine, is not vouched by any of the ancients. Fastidius, indeed, a British writer, who flourished at this time, betrays, in his writings, a strong bias to the Pelagian tenets. But it may be justly questioned whether he was a bishop. For in the treatise which he wrote on the duties of a Christian life, he makes excuses for taking upon him to instruct others; which a bishop would hardly have done, that being his province and duty. (\*) However, if the British bishops did not countenance the Pelagian doctrine, neither did they oppose it, at least with the vigor they might; else it had never made, in so short a time, the progress it did. The catholics, having no prospect of relief from their own pastors, had recourse to those of Gaul; who, being affected with their complaints, immediately summoned a great council, and chose, with one voice, St. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and St. Lupus, bishop of Troyes, to pass over into Britain, and there maintain the catholic cause.<sup>2</sup> Thus Constantius, a presbyter of Lyons, who lived in this century, and after him Bede. But Prosper, who flourished likewise in this century, writes, that the two prelates were sent into Britain by Celestine.<sup>3</sup> The Gallican bishops, perhaps, acquainted the pope with the choice they had made, and he approved it; which was enough for Prosper, a notorious flatterer

church. However, as they reserved the best habits they had for the sacred functions, and used them on no other occasion, when modes in dress began to alter, the fashion changed before they were worn out. Thus, by degrees, the dress which they used in the church varied from their common dress, as well as from that of the people; the new habits for the service of the church being made after the mode of the ancient, in which they were accustomed to perform their functions. Anastasius, Platina, and Baronius, give us particular accounts, I may say, the history, of every part of the mass-priest's dress, instituted, according to them, and used long before this time.

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. chr.

(\*) Besides, the Benedictines, in their edition of the works of St. Austin, assure us, that, in a very ancient manuscript copy of Gennadius, Fastidius is not styled bishop, the word bishop being added to the original copy in a much fresher hand. And yet most of our modern writers not only suppose him to have been bishop, but bishop of London. (a)

(a) Vid. Miræum in not. ad Gennad.

<sup>2</sup> Constant. l. 1. c. 19. apud Surium, l. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Prosp. chron.

of the popes, to ascribe the whole to Celestine. The two missionaries set out for Britain in the latter end of the year 429, and, passing through Paris, had an interview there with the famous St. Genevieve, who, at the persuasion of St. Germanus, to whom her future sanctity was revealed, promised to consecrate her virginity to Jesus Christ. From Paris they pursued their journey to the sea side, and embarked; but were very near being cast away by a storm, before they reached the British coast. This storm the author supposes to have been raised by the devil; but we may more reasonably suppose it to have been raised by himself, that he might have an opportunity of displaying the power of his imagination in describing it, and make room for the miracle by which it was laid. For St. Germanus, who had slept the whole time, being awaked by the mariners just as the vessel was on the point of sinking, first reprimanded the sea, as Neptune did of old the winds, for attempting to defeat their pious undertaking; and then pouring into it a few drops of oil, assuaged at once the fury of the waves, and miraculously restored the wished-for calm. Upon their landing, the people flocked to them from all parts; and, being convinced of the truth which they preached, by the miracles which they wrought, abjured daily by thousands the Pelagian doctrine, which they had so rashly embraced. But their teachers and leaders kept out of the way: they were unwilling to enter the lists with men, whom Heaven had endowed with such miraculous powers. However, as the whole of their cause was now at stake, they agreed, at last, to meet the two prelates, and met them accordingly. But this meeting proved fatal to the Pelagian cause; for the Pelagians declining to undertake the cure of a blind girl that was presented to them, St. Germanus, by applying to her eyes some relics, which he always carried about with him, cured her at once of her blindness, and with her the whole island.<sup>1</sup> But these miracles were soon forgotten: according to the same author, the Pelagian heresy took root again, and new miracles were wanted to check its growth. Germanus therefore, in the year 447, returned to Britain; exerting here anew his wonder-working power, confounded his antagonists, and, not leaving behind him the least shoot of so poisonous a weed, returned in triumph to Gaul.<sup>2</sup> In his second journey into Britain he is said to have been attended by St. Severus, bishop of Treves.

The following year, 430, is one of the most remarkable years in the annals of the church. For it was in that year that the famous dispute began between Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, and St. Cyril, bishop of Alexan-

<sup>1</sup> Constant. ubi supra.

<sup>2</sup> Constant. vit. S. Ger. 1. 2. c. 1. apud Sur. t. 3. 30. Julii.



What occasioned this dispute. The characters of Cyril and Nestorius. Cyril will not allow Nestorius to explain his meaning. He defames him and writes against him to the emperor. Nestorius excommunicates and deposes those who side with Cyril. Causes some of them to be imprisoned and whipped. Nestorius strives to gain Celestine and the western bishops. Cyril writes to Celestine, and sends him the homilies of Nestorius, with his own comments upon them.

dria, which rent the whole church into two opposite and irreconcilable factions. What gave occasion to that dispute was, the title of "mother of God," which began at this time to be commonly given to the Virgin Mary. Such a title Nestorius thought very improper, derogatory to the majesty of the Eternal Creator, and only calculated to lead the unwary into gross mistakes concerning the mystery of the incarnation, and the nature of Christ. For he argued, that it could not be said, without a kind of blasphemy, "that God was born of a woman, that God had suffered, that God had died," nor, consequently, "that the Virgin Mary was the mother of God. We must not imagine," said he, "that God, or the Word, was born of the Virgin Mary; but we ought to believe, that God, or the Word, was united to him, who was born of the Virgin Mary."<sup>1</sup> The title of "mother of Christ" was that which he thought should be given to the Virgin, as containing all that was meant by the other, without the impropriety and offence of the expression, and without danger of confounding the divine nature of Christ with the human. This doctrine was received, and maintained with great warmth by some, both ecclesiastics and laymen, and with no less warmth opposed by others. The latter thought it was calling in question the divinity of Christ, and degrading the Virgin Mary, to rob her of the glorious title of the "mother of God;" and her glory was now become one of their highest concerns. At the head of these was St. Cyril, a man of a most haughty and imperious temper, impatient of contradiction, obstinately wedded to his own opinion, passionate, revengeful, and more eagerly bent, at least in the present dispute, upon conquering his adversary, than discovering the truth. In some of these qualities he was well matched by Nestorius; but the latter was not so eager for victory, so tenacious of his own opinion, or rather of his own terms, (for the whole dispute was about terms) as not to be ready to explain them; which had he been allowed to do, an end had been put at once to the quarrel. But Cyril would hearken to no explanations. He peremptorily required Nestorius to acknowledge and confess the Virgin Mary to be the "mother of God," without any distinction or explanation; and because he would not comply, he defamed him all over the east, as a reviver of the heresy of Paul of Samosata, denying the real union between the human and the divine nature in the person of Christ; stirred up the people of Constantinople, his own flock, against him; and spared no pains to discredit him with the emperor, and other great persons at court. For he wrote three

letters to court: one to the emperor Theodosius, to his wife Eudoxia, and to his sister Pulcheria; another "to the Queen's Virgins, and Brides of Christ," that is, to Pulcheria and her sisters; and a third "to the empresses," that is, to Eudoxia and Pulcheria. The purport of these letters was to prove, that the Virgin Mary was, and ought to be styled, the "mother of God;" that to dispute such a title was rank heresy; and that whoever disputed it was unworthy of the protection of the imperial family.

Nestorius, being now sensible, that Cyril was determined to keep no measures with him, resolved, in his turn, to keep none with one who had given him so great provocation. He therefore assembled a council at Constantinople, and there, with the unanimous consent of the bishops, who composed it, he solemnly excommunicated the laymen, and deposed the ecclesiastics, who rejected his doctrine.<sup>1</sup> He did not stop here; but caused several ecclesiastics, monks, and laymen, the friends of Cyril, to be apprehended, to be dragged to the public prison, and to be there whipped very severely, as disturbers of the public peace, and sowers of heresy and sedition. What chiefly provoked him, was a paper posted up in a public place of the city, declaring him a heretic, and guilty of the heresy formerly held by Paul of Samosata, denying a true union between the Word and the humanity in the person of Christ; which was one of the many calumnies broached against him by Cyril to blacken his reputation.

Thus were the Christians in the east divided into two opposite parties, irreconcilably incensed against each other, and reviling each other with all the opprobrious names malice and rage could suggest. But Cyril's party was by far the most numerous and powerful. Nestorius therefore, having striven in vain to strengthen his party in the east, resolved in the end to try the west, being well apprised, that the authority of the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops, would be abundantly sufficient to turn the scale. He therefore wrote a long letter to Celestine, acquainting him with what had passed in the east, and explaining, without the least disguise or equivocation, the doctrine he held; nay, he sent him all the homilies, which he had preached on that subject. In this letter he owns his irreconcilable aversion to the words "mother of God," as raising ideas, especially in the minds of the vulgar, inconsistent with the majesty of the Supreme Being. He adds, that by disputing the title of "mother of God," he only meant, that the Word was not born of the Virgin Mary.<sup>2</sup>

St. Cyril, being informed that Nestorius had written to Celestine, summoned a coun-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1124. Cyr. ep. 38. Petav. dog. theolog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. t. 3. p. 349—356.



The popish writers have no occasion to boast of the recourse had by Cyril to Celestine. Nestorius condemned by a council held at Rome. Celestine acquaints Nestorius with the judgment of the western bishops. Celestine appoints Cyril his vicegerent.

cil at Alexandria; and by their advice, wrote the famous letter to Celestine, which has reached our times. In that letter he acquaints him with the state of affairs in the east, and the disturbances raised there by Nestorius, as if himself had been no ways concerned in them; tells him that it is absolutely necessary, that all the bishops of the church should unite as one man against that prelate; that the bishops in the east are well disposed to join in the common cause; and that they only waited to know from him, whether they were to communicate with Nestorius, or openly renounce his communion. At the same time Cyril sent to Rome the homilies of Nestorius, the letters which he had written to him, his answers, and with them a writing containing the sentiments of the fathers concerning the mystery of the incarnation. For the gospel, the "testimony of Christ," was already laid aside, and the testimony of men taken, in most disputes, for the rule and standard of the Christian belief. The Roman catholics have no reason to boast, as they do, of the recourse had by St. Cyril on this occasion to the pope. For Posidonius, one of Cyril's deacons, who was despatched with the above-mentioned papers to Rome, was directed, in his private instructions, not to deliver them, but to bring them back to Alexandria, if he found that Nestorius had not applied to Celestine;<sup>1</sup> so that if Nestorius had not recurred to the pope, Cyril never would. Posidonius found, upon inquiry, that Nestorius had written to Celestine; and theretore delivered to him, pursuant to his instructions, all the papers with which he was charged. Cyril wrote in Latin, and even caused the homilies of Nestorius to be translated into that language, with his own comments upon them; whereas Nestorius had sent them in the original Greek, and wrote his letters in the same tongue; which had obliged Celestine to send them into Gaul, to be translated there by the famous Cassian, who was a native of Thrace, and lived then at Marseilles, there being none, it seems, in Rome or Italy, sufficiently qualified for that task. Cyril having thus got the start of his antagonist, though he wrote the last, Celestine was, by his writings, prejudiced to such a degree against Nestorius, before he had heard what he had to offer in his defence, that all he did or could offer afterwards availed him nothing. Celestine indeed perused all his papers as soon as they were translated and sent back from Gaul, but perused them with the strong prejudices which he had imbibed from the writings of Cyril; so that he discovered in each homily, nay, in every line, "heresies, impieties, and blasphemies," not to be uttered or heard.

A council was therefore assembled at Rome, to condemn, rather than to examine, the "new doctrine." At this council, assisted most of

the western bishops;<sup>1</sup> Celestine presided; the homilies were read, and with them the letters both of Cyril and Nestorius. Celestine made a long speech, to prove not only by the passages which Cyril had suggested to him out of the fathers, but by others from St. Hilarius, from pope Damasus, and from a hymn which St. Ambrose had caused to be yearly sung by his people on Christmas day, that "the Virgin Mary was truly the mother of God."<sup>2</sup> When he had done, Nestorius was declared the author of a "new and very dangerous heresy," Cyril was highly extolled for opposing it, his doctrine was applauded by all as strictly orthodox, and sentence of deposition pronounced against such ecclesiastics as should refuse to sign it.

Before the council broke up, Celestine wrote to Nestorius, acquainting him with the judgment of the western bishops upon this dispute; and at the same time warning him, that if, in the term of ten days after the receipt of that letter, he did not publicly condemn the doctrine which he had hitherto taught, and teach the doctrine which he had hitherto condemned, he should be deposed without any further delay, and cut off from the communion of the church.<sup>3</sup> This letter is dated the 11th of August of this year, 430. He wrote several other letters, all bearing the same date, namely, one to Cyril; one to the clergy, monks, and people of Constantinople; one to each of the bishops of the chief sees; and one to the church of Antioch. All these letters were to the same effect, namely, to acquaint those, to whom they were addressed, with the sentence pronounced by the council of Rome against Nestorius, and encourage them to be assisting in the execution of it. His letter to Cyril deserves particular notice: for he there appoints him to act in the present affair, that is, in excommunicating and deposing Nestorius, "as his vicegerent, in the name, and with the authority, of his see."<sup>4</sup> It must be observed here, that the bishops of Rome, neither alone, nor jointly with the whole body of the western bishops, had, or even claimed at this time, the power of deposing the bishop of Constantinople, or indeed any other bishop in the east, without the consent and concurrence of the eastern bishops. This Cyril well knew; and therefore lest Celestine should, on that consideration, decline giving judgment against Nestorius, he made him believe, that the eastern bishops were all disposed to join against the pretended heresiarch; that they waited only his determination, and were ready to concur, to a man, in executing the judgment which he should give. This was making Celestine believe, that the eastern bishops had chosen him for their judge in the present

<sup>1</sup> Mercat. t. 1. p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 379. Arnobii Junioris cum Serap. conflict. p. 548.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 374—376.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 349.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 346. & concil. app. per Balus. p. 45.



He is imposed upon by Cyril. Cyril sends Celestine's letter to Nestorius; and requires him to retract his pretended errors, on pain of being deposed. Nestorius inclined to yield for the sake of peace. The doctrine of Cyril judged impious by the orientals. An oecumenical council summoned by the emperor to meet at Ephesus.

dispute, and agreed to acquiesce in his decision. It was upon this presumption that Celestine pronounced the above-mentioned sentence against Nestorius, and appointed Cyril to act in his room, with the authority which he falsely supposed to have been granted him on this occasion. I say, "falsely," for what Cyril wrote to him was absolutely false, namely, that all the bishops in the east were ready to join him against Nestorius, and concur in executing the sentence which he should pronounce. Several bishops had declared for Nestorius, and not one, that we know of, against him, at the time Cyril wrote, besides Cyril himself, and the other Egyptian bishops, who were entirely governed by him; nay, the sentence pronounced at Rome was matter of great surprise to all, but more especially to John of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, who could not help censuring, with some sharpness, the western bishops, as acting rashly in an affair that required the most mature deliberation. But Cyril was chiefly to blame, who, to engage the western bishops on his side, and by their means compass the ruin of his antagonist, had represented the state of affairs very differently from what it really was.

It was doubtless a very extraordinary thing for a bishop of Alexandria to accept the commission of viceroy or deputy to the bishop of Rome; and Celestine would hardly have thought of offering him such a commission, if he had not been sensible that, from the heat of his passion upon this occasion, he would be willing to act in any capacity, that would empower him to hurt his antagonist. So ably did the popes, from the earliest times, avail themselves of every circumstance that could give them the means to promote and extend their jurisdiction!

The above-mentioned letters from Celestine were all sent to Cyril, who was to convey them to those they were addressed to; which he did accordingly, accompanying them with letters of his own, all calculated to inflame his colleagues and the rest of the clergy, as well as the laity, against Nestorius, as an enemy to "the mother of God" and the catholic church. As for the letter to Nestorius himself, he despatched four bishops with it to Constantinople, who chose to deliver it to him while he was assisting at Divine service, in the great church, with his clergy, and many persons of distinction belonging to the court. His view in this was to render their legation the more solemn, and thereby alarm the populace, who hitherto had taken no part in the quarrel. With Celestine's letter they delivered to him one from Cyril, peremptorily requiring him to retract his errors, to confirm his retraction with a solemn oath, and publicly to anathematize twelve propositions contained in the letter, and extracted out of his works. Cyril let him know, that if he did not comply

with his demand, before the time fixed by Celestine was expired, he would take care to have the sentence of the western bishops executed with the utmost rigor and severity. Nestorius received the letters, and desired the legates to meet him the next day at his own house; but when they came, he did not admit them; nor did he return any answer either to Celestine or Cyril. However, in a sermon which he preached six days after, that is, on Saturday, the 13th of December, he declared, that, to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the church, to put an end to the present dispute, which might be attended with greater evils than his enemies seemed to be aware of, he was ready to grant the title of "Mother of God" to the Virgin Mary, "provided nothing else was thereby meant, but that the man born of her was united to the Divinity." This sermon, and another which he preached the next day, the 14th of December, on the same subject, he sent to John, bishop of Antioch, one of the most eminent prelates both for piety and learning at that time in the church. John perused them with great attention, and finding nothing in them that was not, in his opinion, entirely agreeable to the catholic doctrine, he concluded the present dispute to be happily ended. But Cyril was not yet satisfied; he peremptorily required Nestorius to anathematize the twelve propositions which I have mentioned above; and to anathematize them was, in the opinion of the bishop of Antioch, and of almost all the bishops of his patriarchate, anathematizing the doctrine of the church, and approving that of the Apollinarists, which had been condemned by the church. For Cyril, in combating the distinction maintained by Nestorius between the two natures in Christ, seemed to have run headlong into the opposite doctrine confounding the two natures; insomuch that John of Antioch thought himself not only obliged to warn his colleagues in the east, by a circular letter, against such impious doctrines, but to cause them to be confuted in writing, by two of the most learned prelates of his patriarchate.<sup>2</sup> They were answered by Cyril, incapable of yielding, or even giving up a cause, which he had once undertaken to defend. Thus a new quarrel broke out between Cyril and the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, of which it is foreign to my purpose to give here an account.

Nestorius, foreseeing the storm that the dispute between him and Cyril was likely to raise in the church, had, in order to prevent it, applied to the emperor Theodosius for the assembling an oecumenical council, even before he received the letters of Celestine and Cyril, which I have mentioned above; and, upon his application, the emperor had sum-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 395—410. Socr. l. 7. c. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1150. Liberat. c. 4.



Theodosius' letter to Cyril. Irregular proceedings of the council. The sentence they pronounced against Nestorius. In what terms they acquainted Nestorius with the sentence pronounced against him. The council of Ephesus unworthy of that name.

moned a council to meet at Ephesus by Whitsuntide of the following year, 431. The letter, which Theodosius wrote on that occasion, was dated the 19th of November, 430, and addressed to all the metropolitans, who were thereby enjoined to attend at the place and time appointed, and bring with them such of their suffragans as might be well spared from the service of the churches in their respective provinces. Besides the circular letter to all metropolitans in common, Theodosius wrote to Cyril in particular, to let him know that he looked upon him as the sole author of the present disturbances, and therefore expected that he would not fail to attend the council at the time appointed; that from him he would admit of no excuse; that his punctual compliance with the present order was the only means of regaining his favor, and inclining him to think that it was not any private pique, or animosity, but a persuasion that he was defending the truth, which had prompted him to act, as he had hitherto done, so contrary to all the rules of modesty and discretion. In the same letter he reproaches Cyril, and in the sharpest terms, with pride, arrogance, and presumption; and even charges him with having attempted to sow division in the imperial family. But this charge was groundless, having no other foundation, but Cyril's having written apart to Pulcheria and her sisters, which the emperor supposed to have been done with a design to raise a misunderstanding between him and them.<sup>1</sup>

The council met at the time and place appointed, pursuant to the emperor's orders. But every thing was transacted in that assembly so contrary to all the rules of justice, and even of decency, with so much prejudice and animosity, that they seemed to be all actuated by the spirit of Cyril, and to have met with no other view than to gratify his private passion and revenge. Cyril presided, who was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius. They began their sessions before the arrival of John of Antioch, and the bishops of that patriarchate, who were supposed to favor Nestorius, though they had certain intelligence of their being within a few days' journey of Ephesus; nay, they would not even wait for the pope's legates, and a good number of bishops who were coming from Italy, and the Island of Sicily. Nestorius and count Candidianus, whom the emperor had sent to assist at the council in his name, earnestly begged them to put off the sessions only for four days longer, assuring them that John and his suffragans would reach Ephesus within that time. But all in vain: they were determined to condemn Nestorius, right or wrong; and therefore could by no means be prevailed upon to wait the arrival of those who, they apprehended, would

oppose, and perhaps might entirely defeat the end for which alone they seemed to believe they had been assembled. Nestorius was summoned to appear the very next day, and clear himself before the council of the impious doctrine with which he was charged. He refused to comply till the orientals, that is, those of the patriarchate of Antioch, were arrived; and, upon that refusal, the council met very early next morning, read all his letters and homilies, condemned the doctrine they contained, approved the doctrine of Cyril, whose letters were likewise read; and closed this very remarkable session with pronouncing sentence of deposition and excommunication against Nestorius, in the following terms: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, against whom the most wicked Nestorius has levelled his blasphemies, declares him, by the mouth of this council, deprived of the episcopal dignity, and cut off from the communion of the episcopal order."<sup>1</sup> This sentence was signed by all the bishops who were present, pasted up in the most public places of Ephesus, and notified to all the inhabitants by the criers of the city. It was no sooner known than the whole city resounded with loud shouts of joy, the streets were illuminated, and the people, crowding to the church where the council was held, attended the bishops with lighted torches in their hands, and great acclamations, to their respective habitations, the women walking before them, and burning perfumes.<sup>2</sup> It had been as dangerous for Nestorius to show himself in Ephesus, at this juncture, as it was formerly for St. Paul, the Ephesians being no less devoted now to the Virgin Mary than they were in the apostle's time to their great Diana, and their superstition no less mischievous, though the object was changed. The Virgin Mary was the patroness of Ephesus, the Ephesians believing then that they possessed her body. But it is now believed by the church of Rome, that she was taken up, soul and body, into Heaven, and the festival of her assumption is kept with great solemnity on the 15th of August, being preceded by a vigil or fast. The council took care to acquaint Nestorius with the sentence which they had pronounced against him; and the note which they wrote to him on that occasion shows too plainly, that they were swayed in all they did by passion alone. For the note was thus directed: "To Nestorius, a second Judas."<sup>3</sup>

Such is the account which the ancients give us of the first oecumenical council of Ephesus, one of the four, which Gregory the Great received with as much veneration as the four gospels.<sup>4</sup> But notwithstanding his authority, we may, perhaps, with more truth, apply to this council than to any other what Nazianzen wrote of the councils of his time;

<sup>1</sup> Liberat. c. 4. Concil. t. 3. p. 434.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 534.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 534—547

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 1. p. 560.

<sup>4</sup> Greg. l. 1. ep. 24.



The council of Ephesus protested against by the imperial commissioner and seventy-six bishops. They act contrary to all rules of justice and religion. The conduct of Cyril is sharply censured by his greatest friends. The orientals arrive.

namely, "that he had never seen an assembly of bishops that ended well; that, by assembling, they had always heightened rather than cured the evil; that in such assemblies, passion, jealousy, prejudice, envy, the desire of victory generally prevailed; and that those who took upon them to judge others, were, generally speaking, swayed by some private grudge, their zeal being owing more to the ill will which they bore to the criminals, than the aversion which they had to their crimes.<sup>1</sup> As to the present assembly, it may be justly questioned whether it deserves the name of a council, or ought not rather to be styled a seditious and tumultuary conventicle of men, assembled with no other view but to revenge the private quarrel of their head and leader. For they met against the will of the imperial commissioner, count Candidianus, who represented the person of the emperor; nay, upon his acquainting them that it was the will of the emperor they should wait the arrival of the oriental and western bishops, they drove him by force out of the assembly. Candidianus, seeing the emperor's orders thus trampled under foot by the riotous bishops, entered a protest against their proceedings, and declared them null. This protest was addressed, "To Cyril, and the bishops assembled with him."<sup>2</sup> Nestorius likewise, seven bishops who were assembled with him, and sixty-eight more, all protested against the meeting of the council till the arrival of the orientals: so that seventy-six bishops, who were then actually in Ephesus, protested against, and absented themselves from the council. As, therefore, neither the orientals nor the western bishops were yet come, the assembly was composed only of Egyptians and Asiatics, who were entirely devoted to Cyril. But how irregular soever their meeting was, their method of acting, after they met, was no less irregular. Cyril, who was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius, received the depositions against him, examined the witnesses, gave what explication he pleased to his words, and delivered his opinion the first; which was acting in open contradiction to the known laws of justice and religion. In the first session, several things were transacted, that might have given full employment for several sessions. How could they examine, in so short a time, the twelve propositions which Cyril required Nestorius to anathematize, propositions that were capable of so many different interpretations, that were afterwards so differently interpreted, and occasioned endless quarrels and disputes, some admitting them as catholic, and rejecting the opposite propositions as heretical; others admitting the opposite propositions as catholic, and rejecting them as heretical, without being able

to agree in any thing else but in anathematizing and cursing each other? How could they compare the many passages out of the homilies of Nestorius, with the different contexts, in order to find out his true meaning? To examine so many different propositions, all relating to a subject above our comprehension, and in terms hardly intelligible to the most speculative understanding, to declare which were heterodox, and which orthodox, which were agreeable, and which disagreeable, to the doctrine of the fathers, (for the scripture was out of the question) and all this in a few hours, was, it must be owned, a most wondrous performance. But the orientals were at hand: John of Antioch was a man of great credit: it was apprehended that the many bishops who were then in Ephesus, and had absented themselves from the council, might join him, and he Nestorius. Despatch was therefore to be used, and the business of many sessions transacted in one, that Cyril might have his full revenge before their arrival.

It was in this light that the conduct of Cyril and the other bishops appeared to St. Isidore of Pelusium, a prelate of great learning and sagacity, and one who professed a particular friendship for Cyril. For, being informed of what had passed at Ephesus, he was so shocked at the conduct of his friend, that he could not help censuring it with great severity. "Your conduct," said he, in a private letter to him, "and the tragedy which you have lately acted at Ephesus, are matter of great surprise to some, and diversion to others. It is publicly said, that you sought only to be revenged on your enemies, and that you have therein imitated your uncle Theophilus; and, indeed, though the persons accused may be different, the conduct of the accusers is the same. You had better have continued quiet, than revenge your private injuries at the expense of the public peace, and tranquillity of the church, by sowing dissensions among her members, under the color of piety and religion."<sup>1</sup> Theophilus, whom Isidore mentions in his letter, was bishop of Alexandria, uncle to Cyril, and at the head of the faction that deposed Chrysostom.<sup>2</sup>

Five days after the deposition of Nestorius, John of Antioch and the orientals arrived; and great was their surprise, when they were informed by count Candidianus, who came to wait on them, of what had passed. John had always advised Nestorius to allow the title of "mother of God" to the Virgin Mary, for the sake of peace; but could not think him a heretic for disputing it. But as to the doctrine of Cyril, he looked upon it as rank Apollinarism; and, as such, had caused it to be confuted. No wonder, therefore, if, upon hearing that the doctrine of Cyril had been de-

<sup>1</sup> Naz. ep. 55.<sup>2</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 702.<sup>1</sup> Isid. Pel. l. 2. ep. 110.<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 294.



The orientals insist upon the points that had been so hastily decided, to be examined anew. Which being refused by Cyril, they assemble apart. The two councils anathematize and excommunicate one another. Both recur to the emperor. He approves the deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon. All three arrested by the emperor's order, who endeavors, in vain, to reconcile the bishops. He orders both councils to send a certain number of deputies to Constantinople. He hears them at Chalcedon. Is, at first, favorable to the orientals and Nestorius; but afterwards declares against them.

clared catholic, that the doctrine of Nestorius had been condemned as heretical, and he excommunicated and deposed for holding it, he insisted, as he did, upon their agreeing to have those points examined anew, and more maturely, before he would assist at the council. This demand he thought the more reasonable, as Cyril had assured him, by a letter dated but two days before the meeting of the council, that they should not meet till his arrival. But Cyril, as we may well imagine, would by no means consent to it; which so provoked John, that, after several expostulatory letters between him and Cyril, he assembled, at last, his orientals apart, and, with them, such as adhered to him, about fifty in all. In this new council, the proceedings of the other were examined; and, being found repugnant to the canons, and owing merely to rancor and passion, they were, by the whole assembly, with one voice, declared null. The orientals did not stop here; but, after a strict examination of the doctrine of Cyril, they declared it heretical; and, in virtue of that declaration, pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition against him, against Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, a zealous stickler for his doctrine, and against all the bishops who should communicate with either, till they had publicly retracted their errors. The blow was soon returned by Cyril, and those who sided with him; the orientals were all declared Nestorians, and, with Nestorius, deposed, excommunicated, anathematized. War being thus declared between the two councils, expresses were immediately despatched by both, to the emperor, and their friends at court; for they were both sensible, that the doctrine of those, who had most friends there, would, in the end, prove the most orthodox. The emperor read, with great attention, the accounts transmitted to him by both parties, and would have approved and confirmed the proceedings of the orientals, had he not been diverted from it, first by his physician, named John, and afterwards by Acacius, bishop of Beroë, who happened to be then at court. For the present Theodosius contented himself with approving the deposition of Nestorius, of Cyril, and of Memnon, who, he said, well deserved such a punishment, as being the chief authors of the present disturbances; "For, as to their faith, (he added,) I believe they are all three alike orthodox." Which was true; and more than both councils had been able to find out.

The emperor, having taken this resolution, despatched count John to Ephesus, with orders to drive the three incendiaries, Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, out of the city, and persuade the bishops to assemble in one council. Count John, soon after his arrival, caused the three bishops to be arrested and confined; but could by no means bring about an accommo-

dation between the two parties; the orientals obstinately refusing to communicate with the friends of Cyril, till they had anathematized his doctrine; and his friends no less obstinately requiring the orientals to anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius, before they would communicate with them; so that John was obliged in the end, notwithstanding all the pains he took, to acquaint the emperor, that he had found the minds of the bishops so soured and exasperated against one another, that it was impossible ever to reconcile them. The emperor, upon the receipt of his letter, despatched an order to both councils, enjoining them to send a certain number of deputies, both the same number, to Constantinople, where he proposed to have the points in dispute impartially examined. In compliance with this order, the two councils sent each eight deputies, who immediately set out, with proper instructions, for Constantinople; but, arriving at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus, they were stopped there by an order from the emperor, it not being thought safe for the orientals to enter Constantinople, the monks, who were very numerous in that city, having prejudiced the populace against them. They arrived at Chalcedon in the latter end of August; and, on the 4th of September, the emperor came to the palace of Ruffinus, in that neighborhood, and there heard both parties, with great patience. He was, at first, so favorable to the orientals, that they thought themselves sure of victory; and even wrote to their friends at Ephesus, desiring them to thank him for the kindness he had shown them. But, to their great surprise, the face of affairs changed at once. They had been already admitted four times to the emperor's presence, and heard by him with much kindness: but, in the fifth audience, which they thought would complete their triumph, the emperor, after receiving them with great coolness, told them, abruptly, that they had better admit both Memnon and Cyril to their communion, and abandon the defence of Nestorius. They were thunderstruck with such a proposal, and strongly remonstrated against it. But Theodosius, deaf to their remonstrances, returned the next day to Constantinople, carrying with him the deputies of the adverse party, in order to have a new bishop ordained by them, in the room of Nestorius. Soon after his return, he issued an edict, declaring Nestorius justly deposed, reinstating Cyril and Memnon in their sees, and giving all the other bishops leave to return to their respective churches, they being all alike orthodox.<sup>1</sup> This was declaring the council dissolved; and it was dissolved accordingly; but the disturbances which it oc-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 727—730. Cotel. Monum. Eccl. Græc. p. 41.



To what this change was owing. Cyril did not preside as the pope's legate. The council assembled without the approbation of the pope. The whole dispute about words. Nestorianism an imaginary heresy. Nestorius and Cyril agree in the substance.

casioned, were not composed till many years after.

The sudden change in the emperor, with respect to the orientals, is ascribed by Acacius, bishop of Beræa, to the gold that Cyril caused to be prodigally distributed, on this occasion, among the courtiers. For Acacius writes, that one of the eunuchs of the court, by name Scholasticus, dying possessed of great wealth, the emperor found a note among his papers, acknowledging the receipt of large sums remitted to him by Paul, Cyril's nephew, in Cyril's name.<sup>1</sup> It is true, we are not bound to give credit to Acacius, as Du Pin observes. But in what other manner can we account for so sudden a change, for such an inconsistent method of acting? The emperor thinks both parties equally orthodox, and yet declares Nestorius justly deposed, and restores Cyril and Memnon to their sees; and that soon after he had appeared more favorable to the friends of Nestorius than to those of Cyril. To what else could this be owing, if it was not the effect of bribery?

The pope's legates, namely, Arcadius, Projectus, and Philippus, the two former bishops, and the latter a presbyter, did not arrive at Ephesus till some time after the condemnation of Nestorius; but they signed the judgment that had been given against him, being directed by Celestine to agree in all things with Cyril. Cyril presided as bishop of Alexandria, the first see after that of Rome. While he was absent, Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, supplied his room; a plain proof, that he did not preside as the pope's legate; for if he had, his room could not have been supplied by the bishop of Jerusalem, but by them. Besides, if Cyril had been vested with the character of the pope's legate, what occasion had there been to send three more? Belarmine and Baronius both allow this council to have been assembled by the emperor; but with the previous approbation, say they, and by the advice of, Celestine. That the council was convened by the emperor, is past all doubt, it being said, and repeated above twenty times in the acts, that "they were assembled by the will of the most religious emperors." But of Celestine not the least mention is ever made by any of the fathers, not even by Cyril. The above-mentioned writers found their assertion on a letter of St. Austin, and on the acts of St. Petronius. But both these pieces are now universally rejected as supposititious.

As to the dispute, which occasioned the assembling of this council, the contending parties seem to have agreed in the substance, and to have only quarrelled about words: at least the emperor thought so, as I have observed above; and, what is more, Nestorius himself. For in the letter which he wrote to Celestine, acquainting him with the resolution Theodosius had taken of assembling a coun-

cil, he only told him, that it was for some important affairs of the church; adding, that as to the dispute between him and the bishop of Alexandria, it was not a matter of such mighty moment, as to require the decision of an oecumenical council. And truly both Nestorius and Cyril, so far as we can judge from their own words, acknowledged one person in Christ, and two natures, the natures distinct, but inseparably united; which was the catholic belief. Now the subject of the dispute was, whether, in virtue of that union between the human and divine nature, the properties of the former might, or might not, be ascribed to God, and those of the latter to man. The negative was maintained by Nestorius, and the affirmative by Cyril; the one rejecting as blasphemous, and the other admitting as orthodox, the following expressions: "God was born, God suffered, God died, Mary was the mother of God;" which was plainly disputing about words only, or expressions. It is true, Cyril charged Nestorius with the doctrine of Paul of Samosata, for rejecting them; and Nestorius, Cyril with that of Appolinaris, for admitting them; but neither owned the tenets that were by the other ascribed to him: so that Cyril was only a heretic of Nestorius' making, and Nestorius of Cyril's: Nestorius acknowledged a real union between the two natures in Christ, and Cyril a real distinction. But they did not, and, perhaps, when they were once warmed with disputing, would not, understand each other. "Nestorianism," says a modern Roman catholic writer,<sup>1</sup> "Is but an imaginary heresy. Had Nestorius and St. Cyril understood one another, they had agreed, and prevented the scandal which their quarrelling brought on the church. But the Greeks have always been great disputants; and it was by them that most of the first heresies were broached. The subject of their disputes was, generally speaking, some metaphysical speculation: and their method of handling it arrant chicanery. From equivocal terms, they drew false inferences, and from inferences passed to injuries. Thus they became irreconcilable enemies, and, forgetting truth, fought only to hurt one another. Had they but coolly explained their thoughts, they had found that in most cases no room was left, on either side, for the imputation of heresy."

In the present dispute, Cyril, the more to oppose, or rather to provoke, Nestorius, affected to use, on all occasions, not only the expressions, which I have mentioned above, but others that seem to involve a still more apparent contradiction: namely, "The Eternal was born in time, the impassible suffered, the immortal died, life died." At these expressions the orientals were no less shocked than Nestorius; and therefore separating

<sup>1</sup> M. Simon. hist. crit. de la creance et des coutumes des Nations du Levant.

<sup>1</sup> Lup. divers. ep. c. 41.



What meant by the communication of Idioms. The expressions of Nestorius more proper than those of Cyril. A particular reason for rejecting the title of "mother of God." The fate of Nestorius. He is ordered to return to his monastery.

themselves from the communion of Cyril, whom they concluded to have fallen into the errors of Apollinaris, they insisted upon his either condemning or explaining the expressions he used, before they would admit him to their communion, or any, who communicated with him. He chose the latter; and then it appeared, that they had been all fighting the whole time in the dark; for by those expressions Cyril meant no more, than that Christ, who was God, was born, suffered, and died; that Mary was the mother of Christ, who was God; the very doctrine and expressions which Nestorius had been all along contending for, and Cyril had been combating with so much warmth. But Nestorius was already deposed by the faction of Cyril, and Maximus chosen and ordained bishop of Constantinople in his room.

The expressions of Cyril were approved by the council of Ephesus, and have therefore been adopted by the church of Rome. But her schoolmen, well apprised of the objections to which they are liable, to excuse them from blasphemy, have been obliged to recur to what they call a "communication of idioms," in virtue of which the properties of both natures, say they, may be ascribed to the "hypostasis," or person in whom both natures were united. Thus we may say, according to them, "God was born, God suffered," because the person, who was God, "was born, and suffered." Thus indeed they excuse the expressions of Cyril from blasphemy: but still it must be owned, that the expressions used by Nestorius, "Christ was born, Christ suffered, Christ died," were at least far more proper. For, after all, this "communication of idioms" is, in fact, nothing else but a rhetorical figure: so that Cyril spoke like an orator, and Nestorius like a philosopher: the expressions of the former were, in a strict sense, false and blasphemous; those of the latter, in the strictest sense, true and orthodox. Tropes and figures serve only to disguise the truth, to lead men into errors, and therefore ought to be laid aside by all who seriously inquire after truth, or explain it to others. I shall conclude with observing, that if by a "communication of idioms" the properties of the human and Divine nature may be ascribed to the person, in whom those two natures were united: the properties of the body and soul might, by a like communication, be ascribed to the person, in whom the body and soul are united: so that it might be said, with as much propriety, "man is immortal, man will never die," because the soul is immortal, and will never die, "as God was mortal, God died," because the humanity was mortal and died. The case is parallel, and the "communication of idioms" must justify both expressions, or neither.

As to the title of "mother of God," to which Nestorius had a more than ordinary

aversion, he seems to have rejected it on a particular account; for the same reason that induced Clement XI. to suppress the title of "grandmother of God," which, in his time, began to be commonly given to St. Anne; namely, because "it was offensive to pious ears; *piarum aurium offensiva*." If the Virgin Mary was the mother, St. Anne was, as properly speaking, the grandmother of God. Why then should the mother be robbed of so glorious a title, while the daughter is suffered to enjoy it? Why should Nestorius be deemed a heretic for denying it to the daughter, rather than Clement for denying it to the mother? The one was as offensive to the ears of Nestorius, as the other could possibly be to the ears of Clement. However, the former did not consult his ears alone, but his reason too, as has been shown above; whereas the latter must have consulted his ears only, there being no shadow of reason, why the one title should be allowed, and not the other.

As for Nestorius, he received an order from the emperor, while the council was still sitting, commanding him to quit Ephesus, and retire to the monastery of St. Euprepus in the suburbs of Antioch, where he had led a monastic life before he was raised to the see of Constantinople. This order he received with great joy, having often declared, that he wished for nothing so much as to spend his life in solitude and retirement, far from the troubles that threatened the church.<sup>1</sup> In the letter, which he wrote to Antiochus, the præfectus prætorio, by whom the emperor's order was communicated to him, he told him, that to be thus deposed, for standing up in defence of the orthodox faith, was a greater honor than he had ever presumed to aspire to, or hoped to attain. The only favor he begged of Antiochus was, that he would employ his whole interest at court, in order to obtain public letters of the emperor, that might be read in all the churches, condemning the doctrine of Cyril.<sup>2</sup> The following year, 432, Celestine wrote a very pressing letter to Theodosius, dated the 15th of March, conjuring him, as he tendered the purity of the faith, to confine Nestorius to some uninhabited place, where it might not be in his power to infect others with his pestilential doctrine; which was begging the emperor to drive him out, like a wild beast, from human society, to perish in a desert. He wrote, at the same time, a circular letter to the bishops in those parts, exhorting them to second him with all their power and interest at court.<sup>3</sup> Theodosius, hearkening only to the impulses of his own good nature, withstood all the solicitations of Nestorius' enemies for four years. But, in the end, being made to believe, that by showing mercy to such an obstinate heretic, he rendered himself unworthy of mercy; and

<sup>1</sup> Evag. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. t. 3. p. 744.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. app. p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. l. 3. p. 1070, 1071.



Nestorius is banished into Arabia, at the request of Celestine, and the bishops of his party. His books forbidden, and ordered to be burnt. Is frequently removed from one place to another. Treated with great barbarity. His death. Nestorius himself a cruel persecutor.

that to treat him with severity was the most effectual means of drawing down the blessings of Heaven upon himself, and the empire; his good nature yielded, and he issued an order, addressed to Isidore, then the præfectus prætorio, enjoining him to cause Nestorius to be conveyed to Petra in Arabia, to end his days there, by way of atonement for the mischief he had done. With him were banished, to the same place, count Irenæus, his great friend and protector, and Photius, a presbyter of Constantinople, who had written in his defence against Cyril.<sup>1</sup> The same year the emperor issued an edict, dated the 30th of July, commanding the disciples of Nestorius to be called Simonians;(\*) his books to be every where sought for, and publicly burned; and all persons, in whose possession they were, to deliver them up to the magistrates. By the same edict the Nestorians were forbidden to hold any assemblies in the cities, villages, or in the fields, and the places were confiscated, where such assemblies should be held, as well as the estates of those who should frequent them.<sup>2</sup> This edict was published both in Greek and in Latin, that it might be understood by the subjects of both empires.

The enemies of Nestorius were not yet satisfied; they thought his confinement to Petra too mild a punishment; and therefore, before he had been long there, they prevailed upon the emperor to remove him from Petra to Oasis, in the deserts between Egypt and Libya, a place in which the greatest criminals were usually confined in those days.<sup>3</sup> He was still in Oasis, when Socrates wrote, that is, in 439,<sup>4</sup> but the town being soon after surprised by the barbarians, named Blemmyes, he was carried by them into captivity, but set again at liberty, and even informed by them, that the town would, in a short time, be attacked anew by another clan of barbarians. Upon this information he withdrew to the city of Panopolis, and immediately acquainted the governor of Thebais with the motives that had induced him to quit the place, which he had been confined to by the imperial edict, entreating his highness (*celsitudinem tuam*) to notify them to the emperor, and suffer him to continue there till his pleasure was known. But the governor happened to be a zealous catholic, or rather a true courtier; and therefore, without waiting for the emperor's order,

he sent a band of soldiers to convey, or rather to drag him to Elephantine, on the most distant borders of his government. This the governor seems to have done on purpose to destroy him, and thereby ingratiate himself both with the church and the court. For the soldiers he employed on this occasion, were not Romans, but barbarians; and when they were got above half way to Elephantine, they were enjoined, by a counter order from him, to bring their prisoner back to Panopolis with all possible expedition. As he was hurried on by the merciless barbarians, notwithstanding his old age, the weakness attending it, and the hurts he received from a fall, he arrived at Panopolis, quite spent, and so worn out with the fatigues of that painful journey, that no one thought he could outlive it many days. But the governor was impatient to hear the news of his death; and therefore, before he could recruit his strength, quite exhausted by this journey, he obliged him to undertake another, ordering him to repair, without delay, to a certain place within the territory of Panopolis. As he outlived this journey too, the governor, bent on having the merit and glory of destroying the pretended heresiarch, ordered him immediately to undertake a fourth; and this put an end to all his troubles. For nature sinking under the fatigues he was forced to undergo, without intermission or respite, his strength quite failed him, and he died.<sup>1</sup>(\*)

Such were the sufferings, such was the end, of the famous Nestorius; and both reflect no small disgrace on the ecclesiastics of those times, especially on Celestine and Cyril; for by them this cruel persecution was raised, and by them it was carried on; the laymen being only the ministers of their cruelty and revenge. Such a treatment was quite undeserved by Nestorius, with respect to his doctrine, as I have shown already, but was not so, it must be owned, in another respect: for he was himself a most furious persecutor of all those, who had the misfortune to be stigmatized with the name of heretics; and it is not to be doubted, but Cyril would have met with the same treatment at his hands, had his party prevailed, as he did at Cyril's. In the sermon, which he preached on the very day of his ordination, he thus addressed the emperor, who was present: "make the orthodox faith, O mighty prince, reign alone on the earth; and I will make you reign in Heaven. Lend me your assistance to exterminate the here-

<sup>1</sup> Concil. ib. p. 1058, 1059. & ap. p. 884.

(\*) The emperor ordered them to be so called, merely to render them odious; for there was not the least affinity between the heresy of Simon the magician, and the doctrine that was ascribed to Nestorius. In this Theodosius followed the example of his predecessor Constantine, who to disgrace the Arians, and prejudice the populace against them, ordered them to be called Porphyrians. For when a man was once declared a heretic, all means of rendering him infamous were deemed just and lawful. But neither edict ever took place.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 190. Concil. t. 3. p. 1200.

<sup>3</sup> Socr. l. 7. c. 34.

<sup>4</sup> Idem. ib.

<sup>1</sup> Evagr. l. 1. c. 7.

(\*) An anonymous writer, quoted by Evagrius, (a) relates, that before Nestorius died, his tongue was devoured by vermin, which he interprets as a punishment justly inflicted on him for the blasphemies he supposes him to have uttered. This account Evagrius seems not to have credited; but Theodorus the reader, Theophanes, and Theodoret, have taken it upon the word of the anonymous writer, by whom it was probably invented to render the name of the pretended heresiarch odious to posterity.

(a) Evag. l. 1. c. 7.



The doctrine of the Jansenists approved by Celestine. Palladius the first bishop of Ireland.

tics, and I will lend you mine to exterminate the Persians."<sup>1</sup> This was proclaiming war against all who dissented from him; and the war, thus proclaimed, he began without loss of time, and pursued with the utmost fury, causing the imperial laws against heretics to be vigorously executed, and stirring up the mob, not only in Constantinople, but in the neighboring provinces, against dissenters of all denominations. This occasioned a universal confusion, and, in some places, a great deal of bloodshed; insomuch that the emperor was obliged to interpose his authority, and protect, to a certain degree, as friends to the state, those whom the bishop was for exterminating as enemies to the church. I will not presume to interpret the severity that was practised upon him, as a judgment from Heaven for the severity which he had practised upon others; agreeably to those words of our Savior, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you;"<sup>2</sup> but I cannot help looking upon the treatment he met with, however severe, as a just and well deserved retaliation; and upon him as a man altogether unworthy of our compassion.

But to return to Celestine: In the year 431, he wrote to the Gallican bishops, exhorting them to stand up in defence of the doctrine of St. Austin, and to silence, with their authority, all who opposed it: for it was opposed by many; among the rest by the famous Cassian, as utterly inconsistent with merit and freewill. To this letter are commonly annexed nine articles concerning grace and freewill; and, in these articles, styled there, "the authorities of the bishops of the holy apostolic see," is contained, in the most plain and express terms, the doctrine of the Jansenists, condemned in our days by the famous bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI.<sup>3</sup> It is true, some pretend those articles to be falsely ascribed to Celestine. But they have passed for his, ever since the sixth to the present century: they have been placed among his decrees, by Dionysius Exiguus; were quoted as his by Petrus Diaconus in 519, by Cresconius, an African bishop, towards the end of the sixth century, and by all, who have had occasion to mention them since that time.

The same year died St. Palladius, the first bishop of Ireland. He belonged to the Roman church, and had been sent by Celestine some years before into Britain, to stop the progress of the Pelagian heresy in this island. From Britain he had passed over into Ireland;\* and, having converted there some of

the inhabitants, he returned to Rome, to beg of Celestine that a bishop might be sent thither. Celestine complied with his request, ordained him first bishop of Ireland, and sent him back into that island. Thus Prosper, who lived at this very time.<sup>1</sup> The Irish writers tell us, that, finding their countrymen, whose conversion was reserved by Heaven for St. Patrick, very obstinate, he abandoned the island, and died in the country of the Picts, that is, in Scotland, on his return to Rome.<sup>2</sup> His body, indeed, was long worshipped in Scotland; but that is no proof of his having been ever there.\*

The same writers tell us that St. Patrick was at Rome, when Celestine received the news of the death of Palladius; and that thereupon he ordained him bishop on the 30th of July, 432, about a year after the ordination of Palladius, whose room he was sent over to supply.<sup>3</sup> But that they are therein mistaken, and that St. Patrick was not ordained till many years after the death of Celestine, I shall show hereafter.

Celestine did not long outlive Palladius; for he died the following year, 432, on the 26th of July, having governed the Roman

a barbarous island Christian."<sup>(a)</sup> The island, therefore, which he made Christian, was a different island from that of Britain; and consequently could not be Scotland. The inhabitants of Ireland began, as early as the fourth century, to be known by the name of Scoti or Scots; so that Scoti and Hiberni were but different names of one and the same people. It is true, that St. Patrick, in such of his writings as have been judged by the critics the most authentic, seems to distinguish the Scoti from the Hiberni: but that distinction is only with respect to merit and rank; for he speaks constantly of the former as men of a superior rank to the latter. And indeed the name Hibernus, though more ancient by many ages than that of Scotus, appears to have been in great contempt among the neighboring nations in St. Patrick's time.<sup>(b)</sup> The Hiberni were perhaps the mechanics, and the Scoti the gentry, or men who followed more noble professions. By the latter was afterwards founded the kingdom of Scotland. Bollandus is of opinion, that the Hiberni came originally from Britain, and were the first inhabitants of Ireland; and that the Scoti, a more warlike race, come from some other country, subdued the Hiberni, as the Saxons did the Britons.<sup>(c)</sup>

(a) Prosp. in Coll. 410.

(b) Boll. 17 Martii.

(c) Boll. *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. in Coll. e. 41. & chron.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Boll. 17. Martii.

\* The learned archbishop Usher will not allow Palladius to have been the first bishop of Ireland; alleging against that opinion several fragments out of the lives of Irish saints, some of whom are said to have been bishops, and to have converted many of their own countrymen, as early as the middle of the fourth century.<sup>(a)</sup> From the fragments he produces, I cannot judge of the pieces themselves. But Bollandus, who seems to have perused them, maintains them to be of no earlier a date than the twelfth century; and most of them to be fabulous, which indeed he proves undeniably by several passages quoted from them.<sup>(b)</sup> And can the authority of such pieces invalidate, or indeed any ways affect the authority of Prosper, who tells us in express terms, that Palladius was ordained by Celestine, the first bishop of Ireland? As for what the primate offers to elude the authority of Prosper, it is scarce worthy of notice; namely, that the word *primus* is not to be found in the edition of that writer by Du Chesne. For it is to be found, as Usher himself owns, in all the other editions, and even in Bede, as well as in every other author, who has copied Prosper's chronicle.

(a) Ush. Brit. eccl. ant. p. 781—794.

(b) Boll. 17 Martii.

<sup>3</sup> *Id. ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Socr. l. 7. c. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Mark iv. 24.

<sup>3</sup> See the works of St. Leo, by F. Quesnel, and Du Pin, *Biblioth. eccl. t. 3. part 2.*

\* Prosper writes, that he was sent ad Scotos; whence the Scotch writers conclude him to have been sent into Scotland, and the Scots have long looked upon him as the apostle of their nation. But that he was sent into Ireland, and not into Scotland, is manifest from Prosper's own words. For speaking of Celestine, by whom Palladius was sent into Britain to make head against the Pelagians, while he endeavored, says he, "to maintain the Roman island catholic, he made



## Murder of Hypatia.

church nine years, ten months, and seventeen days.<sup>1</sup> Both he and Cyril have been sainted, merely in consideration of their extraordinary feats against Nestorius, and those who adhered to him; for cruelty to heretics was now a cardinal virtue, capable of atoning for the greatest crimes. As for Cyril, he had no better title to that honour than the monk Ammonius, whom he sainted, and publicly commended as a holy martyr, because he died on the rack for having attempted, at the head of five hundred riotous monks, to assassinate, and dangerously wounded, Orestes, the governor of Alexandria, in a quarrel between him and Cyril.\* Celestine was buried in

the cemetery of Priscilla, where he is said to have caused the history of the council of

rescue, put the cowardly monks to flight at their first appearance, and having seized on the monk Ammonius, by whom Orestes had been wounded, delivered him into his hands. The governor, to deter others from the like attempts, and to mortify Cyril, whom he well knew to be at the bottom of the plot, caused the monk to be tortured with so much severity that he expired on the rack. But Cyril, partly out of spite to the governor, and partly to reward the zeal which the monks had exerted in attempting to assassinate his antagonist, caused him to be honored as a holy martyr, under the name of Thaumasius, being himself ashamed to pay him that honor under the name of Ammonius. (a)

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. ann. 432.

(\*) "The bishops of Alexandria had begun," says Socrates, (a) "to exceed the limits of the ecclesiastical power, and intermeddle in civil affairs, imitating therein the bishop of Rome, whose sacred authority had long since been changed into dominion and empire." The governors of Alexandria, looking upon the increase of the episcopal power, as a diminution of the civil, watched all opportunities of mortifying the bishops, in order to restrain them within the limits of the spiritual, and prevent their encroaching on the temporal jurisdiction. But Cyril, from the very beginning of his episcopacy, bid defiance to the civil power, acting in such manner as showed but too plainly, that he would be kept within no bounds. For soon after his installation, he caused, by his own authority, the churches, which the Novatians were allowed to have in Alexandria, to be shut up, seized on the sacred utensils, and plundering the house of their bishop, Theopemptus, drove him out of the city, stripped of every thing he possessed. (b) Not long after, the Jews, who were very numerous in Alexandria, having one night treacherously murdered several Christians there, Cyril next morning, by break of day, put himself at the head of the Christian mob, and without the knowledge of the governor took possession of the synagogue, drove the Jews out of Alexandria, pillaged their houses, and allowed the Christians who were concerned with him in the riot, to appropriate to themselves all their effects. This the governor highly resented, and not only rebuked Cyril very severely for thus entrenching on his jurisdiction, and usurping a power that did not become him, but wrote to the emperor, complaining of him for snatching the sword of justice from him, to put it into the hands of the undiscerning multitude. This occasioned a misunderstanding, or rather an avowed enmity, between Cyril and Orestes. With the former sided the clergy, the greater part of the mob, and the monks; with the latter the soldiery, and the better sort of the citizens. As the two parties were strangely animated against each other, there happened daily skirmishes in the streets of Alexandria. For the Alexandrians, as Socrates observes, (c) and is well known, were of all people the most seditious and ungovernable. The friends of the governor, generally speaking, made their party good, having the soldiery on their side. But one day as Orestes was going out in his chariot, attended by his guards, he found himself very unexpectedly surrounded by no fewer than five hundred monks come from the mountains of Nitria. The monks were, in those days, the standing army of the bishops; but are now of the popes alone, who being sensible how serviceable such a formidable corps might prove to the apostolic see, not only against the laity, but the bishops themselves, exempted them from their jurisdiction, and made them immediately dependent on themselves. But of the monkish orders, their founders and institutions, I shall speak at length on occasion of their being first taken by the popes into their service. The Nitrian monks in the service of Cyril having surrounded the governor's chariot, first dispersed, with several volleys of stones, the small guard that attended it, then falling upon him, dangerously wounded him, and seemed determined to put an end to the quarrel between him and Cyril, by putting an end to his life. But the citizens, alarmed at his danger, flew to his

The partisans of Cyril, alike mortified and enraged at the death of Ammonius, resolved, at all events, to revenge it; and the person they singled out among the friends of Orestes to wreak their rage and revenge on, was one, who, of all the inhabitants of that populous city, deserved it the least. This was the famous and so much celebrated Hypatia, the wonder of her age for beauty, virtue, and knowledge. She kept a public school of philosophy in Alexandria, where she was born; and her reputation was so great, that not only disciples flocked from all parts to hear her, but the greatest philosophers used to consult her, as an oracle, with respect to the most intricate and abstruse points of astronomy, geometry, and the Platonic philosophy, which she was particularly well versed in. (b) Though she was very beautiful, and freely conversed with men of all ranks, yet those she conversed with were so awed by her known virtue and modesty, that none, but one of her own disciples, ever presumed to show in her presence the least symptom of passion or tenderness; and him she soon cured. (c) Orestes entertained the highest opinion of her abilities, often consulted her, as the other governors had done before him, and in all perplexed cases governed himself by her advice. As she was the person in Alexandria whom he most valued, and in whose company he took the greatest delight, the friends of Cyril, to wound him in the most tender and sensible part, entered into a conspiracy to destroy the innocent lady, and by her death deprive him of that comfort. This barbarous resolution being taken, as she was one day returning home in her chariot, a band of the dregs of the people, encouraged and headed by one of Cyril's ecclesiastics named Peter, attacked her in her chariot, pulled her violently out of it, and throwing her on the ground, dragged her to the great church called Cæsa-reum. There they stripped her naked, and with sharp tiles, either brought with them, or found there, continued cutting, mangling, and tearing her flesh, she bearing it with the greatest firmness and constancy, till nature yielding to pain, she expired under their hands. Her death did not satisfy their rage and fury. They tore her body in pieces, dragged her mangled limbs, with a thousand outrages, through all the streets of Alexandria, and then, gathering them together, burned them in a place called Cineron. (d) Such was the end of the famous Hypatia, the most learned person of the age she lived in, and one of the best, though not a Christian. Who could believe Christians, nay, ecclesiastics, not to say bishops, capable, in those early times, of such barbarities? The account which I have given from Socrates of the tragical end of Hypatia, is confirmed by Damascius in his life of Isidorus, the philosopher, written towards the end of the present century. (e) He makes Cyril the author of that barbarous murder. But Damascius, say Du Pin and Tillemont, was a pagan, and therefore deserves no credit. I wish it could not be made out so easily as it may, that, though a pagan, he deserves to be credited on this occasion. The mob was headed, in perpetrating that horrid murder, by one of Cyril's ecclesiastics; and I do not find, that he was ever punished, or even reprimanded, by his bishop, on that score. When the emperor was first acquainted by Orestes, with what had happened, he expressed the greatest indignation, and a firm resolution to punish the offenders with the utmost severity. But Edesius, a deacon of the church of Alexandria, who resided at Constantinople, with the character of Cyril's nuncio, having gained over the

(a) Socr. l. 7. c. 14.

(b) Soc. ibid. Theophan. p. 70, 71. Suid. p. 976, 977.

(c) Socr. et Suid. ibid.

(d) Socr. l. 7. c. 14.

(e) Suid. p. 977.

(a) Socr. l. 7. c. 7.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Socr. l. 7. c. 13.



Sixtus chosen. First a friend, and afterwards an inveterate enemy, of the semi-Pelagians. He approves and receives the council of Ephesus. He strives to reconcile the oriental and Egyptian bishops. In the year 433, the emperor interposes his authority.

Ephesus to be painted.<sup>1</sup> In the year 820, pope Pascal I. caused his body to be translated to the church of St. Praxedes. And it is still worshipped both there and in the cathedral of Mantua.<sup>2</sup>

Thus far the history of the popes has been merely ecclesiastical, and therefore less entertaining: but the affairs of the church will begin very soon to be so interwoven with those of the state, as to render the history both ecclesiastical and civil. The popes will soon make a very different figure from that which they have hitherto made; no longer mere bishops, but bishops and princes; and the bishop almost entirely lost in the prince; no longer contending only with their colleagues for spiritual power and jurisdiction, but, at the same time, with the greatest monarchs for dominion and empire; nay, em-

ploying the sword as well as the keys, and heading, as directed by their ambition or interest, both councils and armies. We shall see the western empire utterly extinct, and Italy successively invaded, and partly held by the Heruli, by the Goths, by the Greeks, the Lombards, the French, the Italians, the Germans, and the Normans; and the popes managing their affairs, in all these revolutions, with so much art and address, as to reap, from most of them, some considerable advantage for themselves. Events more interesting, though, in reality, not more important, than those which the present volume relates; and which, to the very end of this history, will be succeeded by others, equally proper to excite the attention even of such readers as seek for amusement alone.

## SIXTUS III. FORTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III.

[Year of Christ, 432.] Upon the death of Celestine, Sixtus, the third of that name, was chosen, with one consent, in his room.<sup>1</sup> He was by birth a Roman, the son of one Sixtus, and in 418, a presbyter of the Roman church.<sup>2</sup> At first he favored the Pelagians; but, changing sentiments, upon their being condemned by Zosimus, he became a most inveterate enemy and persecutor of all who professed that doctrine, insomuch that his zeal seemed to exceed all bounds, even to St. Austin,<sup>3</sup> who was at the head of the anti-Pelagian party, and not at all remarkable for his moderation. In the year 430, he wrote a long letter to Nestorius,

ministers, with the large sums that were remitted to him, (not by the mob, or the ecclesiastic who headed them, for he was only a reader), the emperor was not only appeased, but prevailed upon to grant a general pardon to all who were concerned in that riot. (a) But, by pardoning them, he drew down vengeance from Heaven upon himself, says the historian, and was deservedly punished in the persons of those who were most dear to him. (b) He alludes, perhaps, to the unhappy end of Valentinian III. his cousin and son-in-law, who was murdered on the 17th of March, 455, and to the misfortunes which the whole imperial family was involved in after his death.

The church of Rome, which has sainted this man, may think herself concerned in honor to justify all his proceedings; but surely the church of England is not. I shall not, therefore, attempt such a vindication; but having truly and faithfully related the facts from a contemporary historian, shall leave the character of Cyril to be judged of from them, and content myself with wishing, that one, whose zeal for the Christian religion was sometimes meritorious, had better understood the true bounds of that zeal, and the true spirit of that religion, than he appears to have done upon many occasions.

(a) Suid. p. 977. Socr. *ibid.* (b) Socr. *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Anast. p. 547.

<sup>2</sup> Boll. Apr. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Prosp. *chron. monum. eccl. Græc. per Cotel. t. 2. p. 44, 45.*

<sup>2</sup> Prosp. in *Coll. c. 44.*

<sup>3</sup> Aug. *ep. 191.*

exhorting him to yield to Cyril, as the only means of averting the evils, that were ready to fall on him.<sup>1</sup> But Nestorius was already too far engaged in the dispute to follow his advice. Soon after his election he wrote to Maximus, who had been raised to the see of Constantinople, in the room of Nestorius, and to several other bishops in the east to let them know, that he approved and received the council of Ephesus.<sup>2</sup>

He spared no pains to reconcile the oriental and Egyptian bishops. The former, under John of Antioch, would not own Nestorius to have held heretical doctrines, or to have been lawfully deposed; and the latter, under Cyril, peremptorily insisted on their condemning him as a heretic, and signing his deposition. It must be observed, that the orientals did not maintain the doctrine that was ascribed to Nestorius, but only that Nestorius held no such doctrine: so that it was a question *de facto*, and not *de jure*, that kept the contending parties thus divided. Sixtus wrote a circular letter to the orientals, exhorting them to peace and concord: but as peace and concord were only to be purchased by signing the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, his exhortations had not the desired effect.<sup>3</sup> At last Theodosius, who was a weak and bigotted prince, ascribing the bad success of his arms in Africa to his neglect in procuring the tranquillity of the church, thought himself obliged to interpose his authority. He wrote accordingly to the heads of the two parties,

<sup>1</sup> Gennad. c. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 1178.

<sup>3</sup> Cotel. *ibid.*



John of Antioch and Cyril at last reconciled. The orientals divided among themselves, some of them adhering to their patriarch, and some to Nestorius. The latter wrote to Sixtus in favor of Nestorius. The patriarch of Antioch recurs to the secular power. Some bishops comply with the imperial edicts, and condemn Nestorius.

John of Antioch, and Cyril, commanding the former to anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius, and sign his deposition; and the latter to anathematize his own anathemas against Nestorius. John obeyed with great reluctance: Cyril would not retract a syllable of what he had said or written, during the dispute. However, he condescended, in the end, to explain such of his propositions as had given most offence. With that explanation John was, or pretended to be satisfied, and the communion between him and Cyril was renewed.<sup>1</sup>

The conduct of John was highly commended by some of his party, but no less blamed by others. The former, finding Cyril unalterably bent on the ruin of Nestorius, thought it would be no crime to sacrifice one man to the public welfare, and the tranquillity of the church. But the latter, not casuists enough to think evil might be done, that good might come, could on no consideration be prevailed upon to abandon Nestorius, or own him guilty: nay, looking upon their patriarch as a betrayer of the common cause, they met at Anazarbus, in Cilicia, and there not only excommunicated anew, and deposed Cyril; but with great solemnity pronounced the same sentence against all who communicated with him. Having thus revolted from their own patriarch, they wrote to Sixtus, giving him a particular account of the irregular proceedings of the council of Ephesus, clearing Nestorius from the calumnies of his enemies, charging Cyril with heretical and impious doctrines, and censuring, in the sharpest terms, John of Antioch, for communicating with him, without requiring him to condemn the doctrine for which he had cut him off from his communion. This letter was signed by the bishops of Syria Euphratensis, of the two Cilicias, of Bithynia, Thessaly, and Mœsia;<sup>2</sup> so that many bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, though abandoned by their patriarch, still continued to adhere to Nestorius, and thinking him unjustly condemned, stood up in defence of his innocence. The answer of Sixtus to this letter has not reached our times; but we may well suppose it to have been entirely agreeable to those which he wrote soon after his election, to John and Cyril, commending them for sacrificing their private animosities to the public tranquillity, and approving their agreement, as well as the terms, on which they had agreed.<sup>3</sup>

The patriarch of Antioch, greatly concerned to see his authority thus scorned, and set at nought, by those of his own patriarchate, wrote several letters to the refractory bishops, striving to convince them, that Nestorius had been justly deposed: but, finding that his ar-

guments and reasons were of no greater weight with them than his authority and example, he had recourse in the end to more effectual means of convincing, penal laws, and imperial edicts. Accordingly, at his request, two edicts were enacted, commanding all the bishops to be driven from their sees, and sent into exile, who should refuse to communicate with the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, or to sign the condemnation of Nestorius. As these edicts were executed with the utmost severity, most bishops complied. But Alexander of Hierapolis, metropolitan of Syria Euphratensis, and Eutherius of Tyana,\* two of the most eminent pre-

---

\* He wrote an excellent treatise, which has long passed under the name of St. Athanasius, and was by Photius ascribed to Theodoret, but is quoted by Marius Mercator, who lived at this very time, as the work of Eutherius. In that piece the author first enumerates the many evils that were ready to fall upon those of his party; evils capable, as he expresses it, of affording a no less copious subject for lamentations than those which the prophet Jeremiah formerly complained of. As it was urged against him, that Nestorius had been condemned by almost all the bishops of the catholic church, he alleges several instances to prove, that the many have often erred, that truths have been often maintained, and supported, by the few; adding, that numbers may indeed frighten, but cannot convince; that in receiving or rejecting a doctrine, we ought not to be swayed by the number, or by the authority, of those who have rejected or received it before us, but merely by the number or strength of those reasons on which it is grounded; that a majority is not always owing to conviction, but often to selfish and worldly motives, and therefore, in most cases, deserves very little regard, if any at all; that, in the present case, many have adhered to Nestorius, and thought him orthodox, till, recourse being had to the secular power, they found that they must either condemn him as a heretic, or be driven from their sees into exile. Were we to inquire what the majority has been owing to in most councils, we should find that it was not to conviction, but to very different motives. And yet, in the church of Rome, all are bound, on pain of damnation, to believe that doctrine, which has the majority on its side. It is this principle that Eutherius undertakes to confute, in the first part of his work, as inconsistent both with reason and facts. In the second part he answers, with great sense and learning, the reasons that some alleged to deter people from reading the scripture; and the very same as those which are still alleged by the Roman catholics for the same purpose. But Eutherius fully answers them, by showing, that whoever reads the scripture with due humility and attention, will there discover all that is necessary for him to know: that the scripture is the standard of our faith; and that such as dissuade men from so useful a study, can have nothing else in view but to prevent, by that means, a discovery of the errors they teach. Eutherius, throughout the whole work, speaks like a true protestant; and, upon protestant principles, rejects the opposite errors. From what he writes, it appears, that about this time, the study of the scripture first began to be publicly discountenanced; so that we need not wonder, if, in this and the following centuries, we shall see truth almost entirely banished from the church, and error, attended by the most superstitious and idolatrous practices, introduced in its room, and every where reigning, without control, till the time of the reformation, when the study of the scripture was again countenanced and revived. The remaining part of this treatise Eutherius employs in clearing the orientals from the errors that they were charged with by the Egyptians, who adhered to Cyril, and in combatting the expressions used by him, and those who followed him. Eutherius was deposed, and confined to Scythopolis in Palæstine, but removed from thence

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1087. Liberat. c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. append. per Balus. p. 810--820.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 1177. Vincen. Lirin. Common. c. 43.



Some bishops refuse to comply with the edicts and are banished. The troubles composed at last. The letter from Sixtus to the eastern bishops a mere forgery. The bishops of Illyricum attempt, in vain, to withdraw themselves from all subjection to Rome. Churches said to have been repaired or enriched by him.

lates at that time in the church, chose rather to lose their sees, than to keep them at the expense of their consciences. Alexander was admired and revered for his piety and learning, even by the most sanguine of the opposite party, who therefore left nothing unattempted to gain him over: but he was so fully convinced of the innocence of Nestorius, and the malice of Cyril, that neither his friends could prevail upon him with exhortations, nor his enemies with threats, to anathematize the one, or communicate with the other, nay, he used to say, that if the dead should all rise up, and advise him to admit Cyril to his communion, he would reject their advice with scorn, and still look upon him as a heretic, unworthy of the catholic communion.<sup>1</sup> Twelve more maintained, to the last, the same sentiments; but they being deposed, and others more compliant ordained in their room, the doctrine, or rather the expressions of Cyril, were universally received, and made catholic; those of Nestorius were universally rejected, and he was condemned as a broacher of heresy. Thus were the troubles, occasioned by the quarrel between the orientals and Egyptians, composed at last, and the church restored to her former tranquillity, which, however, was but short-lived, as we shall soon see.

A long letter from Sixtus III. to the eastern bishops, establishing several of the papal prerogatives, has been long received as genuine, and is quoted by Bellarmine,<sup>2</sup> to prove, that councils ought to be called by none but the pope, Sixtus saying there, "The emperor Valentinian has summoned a council by our authority." But that letter is wholly made up of passages borrowed from the VIIIth council of Toledo, from Gregory the Great, from Felix III. from Adrian, and from the Theodosian and Justinian codes; and therefore evidently supposititious. Sixtus is supposed to have written it on occasion of his having cleared himself before a council, from the charge of debauching a sacred virgin. But the acts of that council are so manifestly fabulous, that even Binius and Baronius have been forced to give them up, though the emperor Valentinian, whom the acts suppose to have assisted at the council, is there said to have referred the pronouncing of the sentence to the pope himself, "because the judge of all ought to be judged by none." It was, without all doubt, to establish this maxim, that the acts of this council were forged, as well as those of the famous council of Sinuessa, which I have

spoken of elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> As for the charge brought against Sixtus, it is indeed vouched by Anastasius and Platina, and those who have copied them, but not by any more ancient, or more credible writer.(\*).

In the time of Sixtus the bishops of Illyricum made several attempts towards the recovery of their ancient liberty. They had borne the yoke ever since the pontificate of Damasus;<sup>2</sup> but as it grew daily more galling, they resolved in the end to shake it off, pleading a decree of the late council of Ephesus, by which it was enacted, that no bishop should claim or exercise any kind of authority or jurisdiction over provinces, which had not been from the beginning subject to his see. Sixtus wrote on this occasion three letters; (†) and, partly by menaces, partly by exhortations, prevailed upon the Illyrican bishops, unwilling to raise new disturbances in the church, to acquiesce, though the above-mentioned decree had been signed by all the bishops of the council of Ephesus, and even by the legates of his immediate predecessor.<sup>3</sup>

Sixtus is said to have built or repaired some churches, and to have enriched others with magnificent presents.<sup>4</sup> Pope Nicolas IV. pretends, that he distinguished the church of St. Mary the Greater with perpetual indulgences.<sup>5</sup> But it is certain, that the name of indulgence, as that word is now commonly understood, was not known in his time, nor many ages after. Three small treatises have long passed under the name of Sixtus;<sup>6</sup> but if they are really his, they must have been written before Pelagius and Cælestius were condemned by Zosimus; for the author, whoever he was, betrays a great bias to their doctrine.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 38, 39.

(\*) To the acts of this council are commonly added, those of the judgment supposed to have been given at Rome, on occasion of an appeal, made to that see, by one Polychronius, said to have been bishop of Jerusalem, and to have appealed from the judgment of his colleagues in the east, to that of the bishop of Rome. The acts of this judgment too have been long received as genuine, and often quoted to prove, that the power of receiving appeals, claimed by the popes, has been acknowledged even by the eastern bishops; nay, one of the popes, Nicolas I. appeals to them as genuine, in a letter, which he wrote to the emperor Michael. And yet that they are a mere forgery, may be as easily as evidently made to appear. For that judgment is supposed to have been given while the emperor Valentinian was the seventh time consul with Avienus, that is, no fewer than eleven years after the death of Sixtus. Besides, it is manifest from the acts of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, that Juvenalis assisted at both as bishop of Jerusalem; and the first of these two councils was held a year before the election of Sixtus, and the latter eleven years after his death; so that Polychronius was not bishop of Jerusalem in his time: it may be even questioned whether there ever was a bishop of Jerusalem bearing that name; at least I can find none in the catalogues of the bishops of that city, that have been handed down to us.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 104, 105.

(†) One of these letters is dated the 8th of July, 435, the other the 18th of December, 437, the third bears no date.

<sup>3</sup> Cotel. ubi supra, p. 88. 90. Concil. t. 4. p. 115. 117.

<sup>4</sup> Bar. ad ann. 440. n. 5. <sup>5</sup> Bolland. 28 Martii, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Biblioth. Patr. t. 5. p. 573, 656.

to Tyre, where he died. (a) His treatise, which every protestant must read with pleasure, is to be found in the second volume of the works of St. Athanasius, under the name of that father, and in the fifth volume of the works of Theodoret, published by Father Garnier.

(a) Concil. append. p. 886.

<sup>1</sup> Lup. divers. epist. c. 148.

<sup>2</sup> Bell. de Concil. l. 2. c. 12.



Sixtus dies. Leo, before his election, archdeacon of the Roman church. Employed with success in affairs of great moment. Chosen while absent in Gaul. He applies himself, with great zeal, to the functions of his office. His sermons. His letters. He extends the law of celibacy, to the subdeacons.

Sixtus died in the year 440, and on the 18th of August, if he governed, as Prosper writes, eight years and nineteen days. He was buried according to Anastasius, in the church of St. Laurence, called "in Lucina," which he had built; and is now honored by the church of Rome as a saint, on account, perhaps, of his having supported, against the bishops of Illyricum, the claims and pretensions of his see; for I know of no other extraordinary merit that could have entitled him to that honor.

## LEO, (THE GREAT,) FORTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III. MARCIAN, AVITUS, MAXIMUS, MAJORIANUS, LEO THRACIUS.]

[Year of Christ, 440.] Leo, surnamed the Great, was a native of Rome,<sup>1</sup> and not of Volterra, in Tuscany, as the pontificals make him; the son of one Quinctianus, and, at the time of his election, archdeacon of the Roman church. When Sixtus died, he was absent in Gaul, whither he had been sent, either by Sixtus or Valentinian, to make up a difference between the famous Aetius, the greatest general of his time, and a lord in that country, of great interest and power, named Albinus. As the western empire was then at the lowest ebb, being overrun by the Goths, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Hunns, and governed by Placidia, and her son Valentinian III. a youth of no experience, and very slender parts, it was apprehended, that a misunderstanding between these two great men might be attended with fatal consequences: and to prevent them Leo was pitched upon as a man of all others the most capable, by reason of his eloquence and address, of succeeding in such a negotiation. He succeeded accordingly; Aetius and Albinus were reconciled, the apprehension of the evils, that their disagreement was likely to produce, was removed, to the great satisfaction of Valentinian and Placidia, and Leo honored by both as the angel of peace, as the deliverer of the empire.<sup>2</sup> When Sixtus died, he was chosen, though at so great a distance from Rome, with one consent to succeed him, no one presuming to stand in competition with a man of his reputation and merit. Upon his return to Rome, which happened six weeks after his election, he was received by the people and clergy, with the greatest demonstrations of joy, and ordained the Sunday following, the 29th of September, 440.<sup>3</sup>

From the very beginning he applied himself wholly to the functions of his office, instructing the people committed to his care by his sermons, and the rest of the Christian world by his letters. He thought the preaching of the word the indispensable duty of every bishop, and more especially of the bi-

shop of Rome.<sup>1</sup> But that duty has been, long since, almost entirely neglected by the popes as well as by the other Roman catholic bishops, among whom there are very few who ever preach, or think it, as Leo did, a part of their duty to preach. He preached ninety-six sermons that have reached our times, of which thirty-two are on the fast of the ember weeks, and twelve on that of lent. He is the first who mentions the former fast, and the institution of it he ascribes to Moses, pretending, in opposition to the unanimous decision of the apostles, in the council of Jerusalem, that the Jewish precepts, with respect to fasts, and several other practices, are binding under the Gospel dispensation:<sup>2</sup> and it is upon this erroneous, or rather heretical principle, that he excludes those from orders who had married widows.<sup>3</sup>

Of the many letters he wrote 141 are still extant entire; and the fragments of several others, calculated, for the most part, to revive the ancient discipline, and banish the many abuses that had crept into the church; but he also enjoined some things not warranted by the ancients, and undoubtedly contrary to the terms of the Gospel. In a letter which he wrote, about the year 442, to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne, he extends the law of celibacy to the subdeacons, who nevertheless were not to abandon the wives they had married, while in the inferior degrees, but, changing the carnal into a spiritual marriage, live with them not as wives, but as sisters.<sup>4</sup> This law however did not universally obtain, even in the suburbicarian provinces, till long after Leo's time; nay, some of his successors, and among the rest, Gregory the Great, thought it very hard that subdeacons should be debarred from all commerce with the wives they had married, or even from marrying.<sup>5</sup> The contrary practice prevailed in Gaul, even in Leo's time, as appears, from the canons of the first council of Orange; of the second of Arles, and of that of Angers, only forbidding deacons to marry. In the same letter Leo

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. chron.

<sup>2</sup> Idem ad ann. 441. Leo serm. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Leo ep. 16. c. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Leo serm. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Serm. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Greg. l. 2. Regist. ep. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Idem serm. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Leo ep. 2.



Leo quarrels with Hilarius of Arles. Occasion of this quarrel. Celidonius deposed in Gaul, appeals to Leo. Leo admits him to his communion. Hilarius repairs to Rome. He speaks, with great liberty, to Leo. Consents to hear Celidonius, in the presence of Leo. His behavior on that occasion, how represented by Leo. Leo causes him to be seized.

declares, that it is no sin for a clerk to give his daughter in marriage to a man that keeps a concubine, nor for the woman, whom he marries, to live with him; and that a man, who quits his concubine to live with his wife, is not guilty of adultery. The concubines spoken of here, were slaves whom their masters lived with, as with their wives, without having any commerce with other women; and it was doubted, it seems, in those days, whether their agreeing to live thus together, might not be deemed a true marriage.

The letter which Leo wrote in 445, to the bishops of the province of Vienne, is no less remarkable, than the occasion on which it was written. Celidonius, bishop of Besançon, being accused of having formerly married a widow, and sentenced some criminals to death, while, being yet a layman, he exercised the office of a judge; Hilarius, bishop of Arles, and exarch of the seven provinces of Narbonne, a most strict observer of the ecclesiastical discipline, as established by the canons, assembled a council, and the charge being proved by several persons of great distinction, and other unexceptionable witnesses, Celidonius was deposed by the unanimous consent of all the bishops, who composed the assembly, and another ordained in his room. From this sentence, which was, no doubt, agreeable to the canons, he appealed to Leo, and, repairing to Rome, complained there of his having been unjustly condemned and deposed: the predecessors of Leo had, but very lately, met with such a check from the African bishops, in pursuing their pretended right of receiving appeals, as had obliged them to give over, or rather to suspend that pursuit;<sup>1</sup> which, one would think, might have deterred Leo from engaging in a like dispute with the Gallican bishops: but he, no less intent than the most ambitious of his predecessors, on the great object, which they all had in view, the exaltation of his see, readily embraced the opportunity that offered, of sounding the disposition of the Gallican bishops, and trying whether he might not, in the same attempt, meet with better success in Gaul, than Zosimus and Celestine had lately met with in Africa. With this view, he not only received Celidonius with great demonstrations of kindness, but admitted him to his communion; nay, and allowed him, in defiance of the judgment given against him in Gaul, to exercise the functions of his office in Rome: but he found the prelates in those parts no less jealous of their just rights and liberties, no less upon their guard, against all papal encroachments, than the most zealous among the Africans. Hilarius had presided at the council, and therefore, thinking it chiefly incumbent upon him, to oppose the irregular proceedings of Leo, and maintain the sentence pronounced

by the council, he no sooner heard of the reception Celidonius had met with at Rome, than he set out, on foot, for that city; and, performing on foot the whole journey, though it was then in the depth of winter, he equally surprised both Leo and Celidonius with his unexpected arrival. Being introduced to Leo, after he had visited the tombs of the apostles and martyrs, he addressed him with all the respect that was due to the bishop of the first city; but, at the same time, with all the liberty of one, who, in every other respect, thought himself his equal: he acquainted him with the motives of his journey; complained of the reception he had given to Celidonius, who had been deposed in Gaul, and yet was allowed to discharge all episcopal functions in Rome; begged he would govern according to the approved and received rules of the church, and redress, at least by a private order, such an open violation of the canons. He added, that if he thought his complaints just, it was to be hoped, he would take care to have the evil speedily removed, on which they were founded; if he did not, that he should give him no farther trouble, not being come to Rome, to engage in a dispute, but only to pay his respects to him; to inform him of the truth; and to beg he would maintain inviolate the canons of the church, and suffer himself to be governed by them alone.<sup>1</sup>

Though Hilarius had declared, that he was not come to Rome to engage in a dispute, which was, in effect, declaring that he did not acknowledge, in Leo, the power of receiving appeals, or re-examining a cause determined elsewhere; yet he consented to hear, in the presence of Leo, and some other bishops, what Celidonius had to offer against the judgment passed upon him by the Gallican bishops. We know but very little of what was said, on either side, at that interview: and that little we know only from Leo, who assures us, that Hilarius behaved with great insolence; that in the transport of his passion, he uttered things, that no layman would have uttered, and no bishop could hear; that he himself, was greatly concerned to see a bishop thus exposing himself, and degrading his character, but bore the whole with great patience.<sup>2</sup> Had Hilarius given us an account of what had passed on that occasion, he had probably told us a different story; at least, the subsequent conduct of Leo leaves great room to question his boasted forbearance and patience; for, upon the breaking up of the conference, without any regard to a man of Hilarius' dignity and character, he caused him to be seized and kept under arrest;<sup>3</sup> an instance of violence, which Rome had not yet seen with respect to a bishop, and in matters,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 167, et seq.

<sup>1</sup> Leonis op. per Quesnel, t. 1. p. 744—754.

<sup>2</sup> Leo ep. 10. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Leon. op. t. 1. p. 744.



Hilarius escapes from Rome, and returns to Gaul. Leo's irregular and passionate conduct on this occasion. He cuts Hilarius off from his communion. And strives to discredit him among the Gallican bishops. What crimes laid by Leo to his charge. Leo maliciously represents some of his actions.

not of faith, but only of discipline. From Leo's own account it appears, that the insolent behavior, which he complained of in Hilarius, consisted merely in his maintaining, with the freedom that became him, the liberties of the Gallican church; in his opposing the encroachments of Leo; and in refusing to acknowledge his pretended right of judging at Rome a cause, which had been already judged in Gaul: for, giving an account of what happened in that interview, he taxes Hilarius with refusing to submit to St. Peter, and acknowledge the primacy of the Roman church;<sup>1</sup> as if the primacy included the power of receiving appeals, which it certainly did not, since all the western bishops owned the primacy at this very time, and not one of them such a power.

Leo, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Hilarius, appointed a day for examining, and judging anew, the cause of Celidonius: but before the appointed day came, Hilarius, that he might not be obliged to appear, or be any ways accessory to such irregular proceedings, found means to escape from his guards, and travelling through by-roads, after a most painful journey, arrived safe at Arles. Leo was so provoked at his escape, that, out of pique to him, he immediately annulled the judgment of the council, at which he had presided, declared Celidonius unlawfully deposed, cleared him from the charge of having ever married a widow, though proved by a great number of unexceptionable witnesses, and restored him to his former dignity.<sup>2</sup> He did not stop here; but in the height of his resentment declared Hilarius cut off from the communion of the apostolic see; deprived him of all jurisdiction over the seven provinces; suspended him from ordaining any bishop, or even assisting at the ordination of any; and, to be more fully revenged on him, utterly suppressed the dignity of exarch, annexed to the see of Arles.<sup>3</sup> Such treatment did the best of men meet with from the bishops of Rome; when, prompted by zeal for the welfare of the church, and the observance of her laws, they attempted to check their lawless ambition and encroachments. Leo carried his resentments against Hilarius still farther; for, in order to discredit him among the bishops of his own diocese, who looked upon him as a true pattern of every Christian virtue, he wrote the letter, which I have mentioned above, well calculated for that purpose, but altogether unworthy of a man of Leo's character and reputation: for, giving an entire credit to every malicious report he had heard, to the prejudice of that excellent prelate, he inveighs against him in the most bitter terms, as one, who was a disgrace to the episcopal order, and therefore deserved to be deprived, not only of the power and jurisdiction,

which he had wantonly abused, but of the dignity itself. To read Leo's letter, so long as he speaks in general terms, one would conclude the bishop of Arles to have been guilty of the blackest crimes; but when he descends to particulars, it plainly appears, that his only crime was, his rebellion against St. Peter, and his not acknowledging the primacy of his see, that is, his not suffering, out of respect to St. Peter, his pretended successors to exercise a despotic and tyrannical dominion over the churches committed to his care: for the only things he charges him with, are, his having ordained some bishops against their will;\* his taking delight in condemning bishops, and excommunicating laymen; his performing the journey, when he visited the diocese, with a quickness and expedition ill becoming the gravity of a bishop. From Leo's words we should conclude, that he rode post, were we not assured, by the author of his life, that he never travelled otherwise than on foot: but the charge against Hilarius, on which Leo lays the greatest stress, is his having ordained a new bishop, in the room of one of his suffragans, named Projectus, who indeed lay dangerously ill, and, as was thought, past recovery, but nevertheless recovered, and was re-established, or rather confirmed, in the possession of his see.<sup>1</sup> Of this remarkable transaction not the least mention is made by Honoratus, bishop of Marseilles, who was one of the disciples of Hilarius, and wrote his life. But, allowing the fact to be true, many circumstances, unknown to us, might have concurred to justify the conduct of Hilarius on that occasion. As Leo does not reproach him with performing that ordination alone, or without the consent and approbation of the other bishops of the same province, which, as both were commanded by the canons, he would certainly have done, had Hilarius failed in either, we may well suppose two bishops more, at least, to have been present, and the rest to have concurred with their suffrages; and that I can hardly think they would have done, but on a very urgent occasion, such an occasion as sufficiently justified the breach of the canon forbidding two bishops to be ordained for one and the same see. However, that breach Leo, blind with passion and prejudice, studies to exaggerate into an unpardonable crime, maliciously suppressing, in order to set it out in the worse light, the material circumstance of the dangerous malady, or rather approaching death, as was apprehended, of Projectus: I said maliciously, because Leo could not be unapprised of that circumstance.

(\*) This practice obtained in several places, and was never before found fault with. St. Austin writes, that in Africa, when men of eminent parts and virtue declined the episcopal dignity, to which they had been named by the people and clergy, they were even kept in prison till they accepted it. (a)

<sup>1</sup> Leo ep. 10.

(a) Aug. ep. 173.

<sup>1</sup> Leon. ep. 10. c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Leon. op. t. 2. p. 744. et ep. 10. c. 3. et 7.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1400. Leo ep. 9. et 10.



Leo sacrifices truth to the exaltation of his see. He applies to the emperor, of whom he obtains a rescript, establishing his authority in Gaul. What required of the Gallican bishops by that rescript. This rescript no proof of the pope's authority over the Gallican church.

In the same letter he employs the whole force of his eloquence in displaying the privileges, and magnifying the authority, of the apostolic see, roundly asserting that, upon appeals from Gaul, his predecessors had frequently reversed or confirmed judgments given there. It were to be wished he had alleged one instance at least to confirm so bold an assertion; but that was more than was in his power to do, Celidonius being the first Gallican bishop who ever thought of appealing from the judgment of his colleagues in Gaul, to that of the bishop of Rome. This Leo could not but know; but probably thought it no crime in so material a point to sacrifice truth to the exaltation of his see.

He was sensible that little regard would be paid to his decrees by the Gallican bishops, to that especially, which suppressed the ex-archate or primacy of Arles. In order therefore to prevent all opposition, and establish at once his authority in Gaul, he resolved to apply to the emperor, and engage in his favor the secular power.<sup>1</sup> Valentinian III. was at this time emperor of the west, a very weak prince, and therefore a fit tool for a man of Leo's craft, ambition, and address. To him therefore he applied, and, having by many false and malicious insinuations strangely prejudiced him against Hilarius, as a disturber of the public peace, nay, as a rebel not only to the authority of the apostolic see, but to the majesty of the empire (for he stuck at nothing), he obtained the famous rescript, vesting the bishops of Rome with an absolute and uncontrolled authority over the Gallican churches and bishops. It was addressed to Aetius, general of the Roman forces in Gaul; and, under pretence of maintaining the peace and tranquillity of the church, Valentinian there requires the Gallican bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic see; which he supposes (as had been falsely suggested to him by Leo) to have been ever practised till the time of Hilarius; he commands all bishops to hold and observe, as a law, whatever it shall please the bishop of Rome to ordain or decree; and strictly enjoins the magistrates to oblige those, who shall be summoned to Rome, to obey the summons. He adds, that as Leo has a right to command what he pleases, with respect to the discipline of the church, there ought to have been occasion for no other authority but his own, to make all men concur in executing the judgment which he had lately given against Hilarius, whom he styles a traitor, and an enemy both to the church and state, both to Leo and himself; nay, he imputes it to him as a crime, that he had, by a bold and unprecedented attempt, deposed some bishops, and ordained others, without having first consulted the bishop of Rome.<sup>2</sup> From

this rescript, which was undoubtedly dictated, if not penned, by Leo, as some have thought, it appears, that, notwithstanding his boasted sanctity, he carried his pretensions much higher than the most ambitious of his predecessors had done; nay, that he aimed at nothing less than to have himself acknowledged as absolute monarch of the whole church. The preceding popes had indeed claimed and exercised a far greater power than was allowed them by the canons; but yet that power they pretended to derive from the canons, as appears from the long dispute between them and the African bishops, with respect to this very point of appeals now disputed by the Gallican bishops.\* But Leo, sensible that his views were too extensive to be any ways countenanced by the canons, however misconstrued, had the assurance to command, without any regard to them, "all bishops to observe as a law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command," and at the same time to declare, "That he had a right to command what he pleased;" which was abrogating at once all ecclesiastical laws, substituting his own will in their room, and assuming to himself, by that means, the soul monarchy of the church. His daring to go such a length was owing to the credit he had with the emperor, both before and after his elevation to the popedom, and to the weakness of that prince, which, being well known to him, encouraged him to make an attempt that would have been vain and absurd under one of a different character. But throughout his whole papacy he never failed to make the utmost advantage he could of his favor with the emperors both in the west and the east, for the advancement of the see of Rome; and in this his example was followed, with all possible care, by his successors.

The rescript of Valentinian has been often quoted by the advocates for the see of Rome, to prove, that the popes have ever exercised an uncontrolled authority and jurisdiction over the Gallican church. For the emperor, say they, by this rescript, grants no new privilege to the Roman see, but only confirms the practice and custom that had obtained, time out of mind. But the authority of the emperor can be of no weight here, since the emperor believed what Leo told him; and what he told him was certainly false, as I have shown above. It is true, that Celidonius was restored, according to the most probable opinion,<sup>1</sup> and Importunus driven out, who had been ordained by Hilarius in his room. But that was owing to the imperial rescript, not to Leo's decree; for Hilarius, and with him the other Gallican bishops, opposed to the last the papal encroachments, and could never be induced to acknowledge the pretended power in the see of Rome, of receiving appeals, and

<sup>1</sup> Leo ep. 10.    <sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1401.    Leo ep. 10.

\* See p. 170.

<sup>1</sup> Chifflet; t. 2. p. 115.



Hilarius strives to appease Leo. He writes to him; and sends deputies to Rome to soften Leo, but all in vain. Auxiliarius employed to mediate a reconciliation. Leo inflexible. Auxiliarius' letter to Hilarius. Hilarius' steadiness. The conduct of Leo repugnant to all principles of morality and religion.

re-examining a cause which they had determined. As for Leo's decree, depriving the church of Arles of its primacy, it has been evidently shown, by a learned critic, that it never took place.<sup>1</sup>

While Leo was using his utmost efforts to bring Hilarius into disgrace with the emperor, and by that means compass his ruin, the holy prelate lay dangerously ill at Arles; and being greatly concerned to see a man of Leo's rank and character abandoning himself thus to passion and revenge, he left nothing unattempted, he could think of, to appease him. He would not indeed yield to his lawless ambition, and, out of a criminal complaisance, give up the just rights and liberties of the church committed to his care and protection, but strove, by all other lawful means, by all kinds of honest submission, to allay his resentment, and bring him to a more Christian temper. He first wrote to Leo, clearing himself, in the most submissive and respectful terms, from the many malicious and groundless aspersions of his enemies, which the pope had credited, without giving himself the trouble to inquire whether they were true or false, and charged him with as real crimes. As Leo did not condescend to answer this letter, the bishop of Arles, actuated by a truly Christian spirit, and mindful of the command of our Saviour,<sup>2</sup> despatched to Rome Ravennius, a man of distinguished merit, at that time one of his presbyters, and afterwards his successor in the see of Arles, hoping, by his means, to remove the prejudices which Leo had imbibed against him. But neither Ravennius, nor the two bishops Nectarius and Constantius, both men of eminent sanctity, whom the metropolitan of Arles sent afterwards, with the character of his legates, to soften Leo, and incline him, if possible, to a reconciliation, could make the least impression on his obstinate mind. He was unalterably bent on having his authority acknowledged by the Gallican church, without limitation, as required by the imperial rescript, and would hearken to no other terms till that was complied with. On the other hand, Hilarius, not caring to purchase the favor of the pope at the expense of his conscience, had strictly enjoined his legates not to agree to any terms that might prove in the least prejudicial to the rights and privileges which they enjoyed by the canons, and of which he looked upon himself as the guardian. With this disposition on either side the legates were soon convinced that it was impossible for them to succeed in their negotiation. However, before they left Rome, they resolved to make one attempt more, and try whether, by the interest of some man in power, they might not prevail upon the pope

to relinquish his pretensions, or, at least, to be reconciled to a man, who opposed them, not out of any disrespect to the apostolic see, but merely because he thought them inconsistent with the canons.

Of all the great men at that time in Rome, Auxiliarius seemed to them the most proper to be employed on this occasion. He was prefect of Italy, and had been formerly of Gaul, where he had contracted an intimate friendship with Hilarius, of whose virtue he entertained the highest opinion. To him, therefore, they applied, and he, glad of the opportunity that offered of serving a friend, whom he so much valued, readily took upon him the office of mediator between him and Leo. But his mediation proved unsuccessful; Leo could by no reasons or remonstrances be prevailed upon either to abate of his pretensions, or admit Hilarius to his communion, till he had owned the power, which he said the Roman see had always enjoyed, and the most pious emperors had lately confirmed, that is, an absolute power over all the churches of Gaul. Auxiliarius, grieved to find that his good offices had not answered his expectations and wishes, wrote the following letter to Hilarius, soon after his interview with Leo: "As you look upon all transitory things with an eye of contempt, and are not capable of being elated with joy, when they succeed, or dejected with grief, when they miscarry, I need not, in writing to you, disguise the truth, out of an apprehension of disturbing the tranquillity of your mind." He then acquaints him with the disposition and temper, in which he had found Leo towards him, and adds, "I see not the least appearance of pride or arrogance in the conduct of your holiness; but men cannot bear plain truth, and are offended, if we speak our thoughts freely. The Romans must be courted, and it is only by condescension and complaisance that they are to be gained. Could you bring yourself to that, you would lose nothing, but gain much by it. I therefore beg it as a particular favor, that you would. A little condescension on your side will lay the storm, and restore the wished for tranquillity."<sup>1</sup> Thus Auxiliarius: but as Hilarius was better acquainted than the prefect seems to have been, with the duty and obligations incumbent on a bishop, he thanked him for his advice, but did not embrace it. On the contrary, he continued to the last steady and unalterable in his former resolution, choosing rather to die out of Leo's communion, than be restored to it by yielding up to his ambition the rights and liberties which had been trusted to his care.

The conduct of Leo on this occasion was so remarkably scandalous, so inconsistent with all principles of morality or religion, that the

<sup>1</sup> Quesnel. dissert. prima de S. Hil. c. 8 et 9.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. v. 23, 24.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 3. p. 1401. Leon. op. t. 1. c. 17. p. 744.



Leo's conduct not to be excused. The Manichees fly from Africa to Rome.

church of Rome, which honors him not only as one of her greatest popes, but greatest saints, has thought herself obliged to employ some of her ablest pens to excuse or rather disguise it. But that it was altogether inexcusable, may be easily made to appear: for, in the first place, the bishop of Rome had no kind of right, even by the canons of Sardica,\* and much less by those of any other council, to the power which Leo claimed, and at this juncture exercised, over the Gallican church. In the second place, because the bishop of Arles, out of a conscientious regard to the canons and established laws of the church, refused to acknowledge such a power, Leo, upon that provocation alone, giving, or pretending to give, an entire credit to every report he heard to his prejudice, without inquiring whether they were true or false, without leaving him room to clear himself, or allowing any one to speak in his defence, condemned him as guilty, cut him off from his communion, and, depriving him of all authority and jurisdiction, reduced the first bishop of Gaul, so far as in him lay, to the state of a layman. 3dly, In order to compass the ruin of the innocent prelate the more effectually, he applied to the emperor, though he had imputed as a crime to Hilarius his having had recourse, (as he falsely supposed,) in ecclesiastical matters, to the secular power; and, representing him not only as a man of an insufferable pride and presumption, but as a rebel to the state, brought him into danger even of his life; and this irreconcilable aversion, this implacable hatred, he maintained to the last, in spite of all the submissions Hilarius could make, compatible with his conscience and duty, to appease him. Lastly, giving full scope to his unbounded ambition, and most egregiously abusing the confidence which the young and inexperienced prince reposed in him, he made him believe what he himself knew, and could not but know, to be false, and by that means surreptitiously obtained a rescript highly derogatory to the liberties of the church, utterly repugnant to the canons of all the councils, that had been held to that time, and calculated only to establish the papal power on the ruins of the ancient discipline, and all ecclesiastical laws. As for Hilarius, the church of Rome herself has cleared him from the many calumnies, with which Leo, and his other enemies, strove to blacken his reputation; for by that church he is now honored as a saint of the first class; nay, even Leo seems, in the end, to have acknowledged his innocence; for speaking of him after his death, he calls him Hilarius of

holy memory;<sup>1</sup> which was, in a manner, retracting all he had written against him.

The jesuit Papebrok, convinced, on one hand, of the innocence of Hilarius, but on the other, not daring to find fault with Leo, pretends to justify both, saying, that the metropolitan of Arles was "guilty before Leo, but not before God," that is, in other words, Leo believed him guilty, though he really was not. And was it excusable in Leo, to believe him guilty, to condemn him as guilty, upon the bare testimony of his avowed enemies, as he certainly did? Ought he not, in conscience and justice, to have heard both parties, as he set up for a judge, before he condemned or absolved either? Besides, it may be very much questioned, whether or no Leo did believe him guilty of the faults, which he lays to his charge, it being almost incredible, that a man of his sense and penetration should not, at least, suspect the truth of what he had heard against a prelate of Hilarius's reputation and character from those only, whose interest it was, as he well knew, to have him condemned.

The zeal which Leo exerted against the Manichees, the worst of heretics, (\*) might

<sup>1</sup> Leo ep. 50.

(\*) As the heresy of the Manichees made a great noise in the church for many ages, and is much spoken of by the fathers, it may not be improper to give a succinct account here of the author, or rather the authors, of that sect, and their tenets. The first principles of the Manichees were broached about the middle of the second century, by one Scythianus, a native of Arabia, who, observing many beings in the universe, opposite to, and incompatible with one another, argued from thence, that the causes, from which they proceeded, were, in like manner, opposite and incompatible. To prove this doctrine, he wrote four small books; the first styled, "the Mysteries;" the second, "the Chapters;" the third, "the Gospel;" and the fourth, "the Treasure." As he had but one disciple, named Terbinthus, he travelled to Jerusalem, hoping to gain some proselytes there, but died soon after his arrival in that city. (a) He was a man of a sprightly genius, and, though he had applied himself to trade from his youth, and by that means acquired great wealth, he had not suffered himself, by his application to business, to be diverted from the study of the Greek and the Egyptian sciences; and is said to have addicted himself chiefly to the study of magic, at that time in great request all over the east. (b) Upon his death, Terbinthus, seizing his books, and all the gold and silver he had brought with him, fled into Persia, and there took the name of Buddas, lest he should be discovered by his true name, and sued by the widow of his deceased master for the effects he had seized. Among the Persians he passed for a prophet, giving out, that he was born of a virgin, and brought up among the mountains by an angel, who had instructed him in all the sciences of the Egyptians: but having one day ventured to enter into a public dispute about his two opposite principles, with the priests of Mithra, or the sun, he was by them so shamefully silenced, that, not presuming ever after to appear, he lived retired in the house of a widow, and left to her, at his death, both the books, and the money, of which he had defrauded his master's widow. The woman seeing herself thus enriched at once, (for Buddas left her very considerable sums) she purchased a slave about seven years old, named Cubrichus, gave him his liberty, adopted him, and, grudging no expense to have him well educated, and instructed in the sciences and philosophy of the Persians, she bequeathed to him the books, and whatever else she possessed at the time of her death. Cubrichus, who

\* By the canons of Sardica, the most favorable to the see of Rome, and fatal to the church, that ever were made, the pope was only empowered, upon an appeal to him, to order the cause to be re-examined, not at Rome, but in the province, and by such of the neighboring bishops as he should name. (a) But Leo claimed a power of summoning bishops to Rome, and judging their cause anew there.

(a) See p. 57.

(b) Epiph. c. 3. Arch. p. 96.



atone, if any thing could, for his unaccountable conduct on this occasion. The Mani-

neither wanted parts nor address, studied the books, with the greatest application; and, having made himself master of the doctrine they contained, and improved it with many new opinions of his own, he began to preach it in the city, where the king of Persia resided, that is, in Seleucia, or Ctesiphon. But first, to conceal his original meanness, he took care to change the name of Cubrichus into that of Manes, signifying, in the Persian language, speech, and alluding to the talent, which he certainly had, of speaking well. (a) And this is the man, who became afterwards so famous, or rather infamous, by founding a sect, which soon spread all over the empire, had great numbers of followers, both in the east and the west, and kept its ground for the space of at least 700 years, in spite of the utmost efforts of the temporal, as well as the spiritual power, combined to suppress and destroy it. His doctrine was, at first, universally rejected with indignation and contempt, especially by the Christians; and, therefore, to render them the less averse to it, he began to mix some of their doctrines with his own, styling himself, in his letters, "Manes, the apostle of Jesus Christ;" and sometimes, the paraclet sent into the world to reform the manners of mankind, agreeably to the promise which Christ had made to his apostles. (b) Having made his escape out of prison, to which he had been confined by the king of Persia, probably Sapor, for killing his son, whom he had undertaken to cure, he fled into Mesopotamia, where he was so confounded, in a public dispute with Archelaus, bishop of Cascar, or Carræ, that he withdrew to a small village on the river Stanga, with a design to keep himself there for some time concealed; but as that village stood within the bounds of the Persian dominions, he was seized there, and carried to the king, who, to revenge the death of the prince he had murdered, caused him to be flayed alive, his body to be thrown to the dogs, and his skin stuffed with straw, to be exposed to public view, on one of the gates of the city, where it was still to be seen in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius. (c) After his death, Archelaus, having assembled all the Christians and bishops in that neighborhood, with great solemnity, anathematized him, his new opinions, and all his followers. (d) Such was the end of the chief author and founder of the famous sect of the Manichees.

As for the tenets of this sect; 1. They held two opposite principles, or natures; the one the author of good, whom they called God; the other the author of evil, whom they styled Satan, but both eternal, immortal, and independent of each other, which was, in reality, admitting two Gods. They believed the light in the sun and the moon, to be the substance of God; and, therefore, adored the sun as the throne of his power, and the moon as the seat of his wisdom. (e) And it was in opposition to that idolatrous worship, that Leo endeavored to suppress the custom that had long obtained among the Christians, of turning to the east when they prayed. He alleges two reasons why it should be suppressed, and both worthy of particular notice; the first, because men may easily pass from worshipping God in the sun, to worship the sun itself; for he supposes some, who, in his time, used to kneel down before the sun, to have paid that respect, not to the sun, but to God in the brightest work of his hands. The second reason he alleges is, because it is a wicked profanation of the worship of the true God, to use the same ceremonies in worshipping him that are used by the pagans, when they worship their idols. (f) By the first of these reasons, images ought to be banished from all places of worship, at least for the sake of the gross and ignorant vulgar, who may easily, and commonly do, pass from the worshipping of God, or our Savior, in an image or statue, to worship the image or statue itself; and I may safely say, that among the Roman catholics, there is scarce one in a thousand, who does not immediately address, in his prayers, the image itself, which is rank idolatry. Of the images of the saints, and the worship that is paid them, I shall speak hereafter. By Leo's second reason, the far

(a) Epiph. c. 4. hæ. Hieru. cat. catech. 6. Arch. p. 98. Euseb. chron.

(b) Epiph. Arch. Cyr. ibid. Aug. hæ. 46.

(c) Cyril. Epiph. Arch. ibid. Socr. l. 1. c. 22.

(d) Arch. p. 100.

(e) Aug. hæ. 46. in Faust. l. 5. c. II.

(f) Leo ser. 7. in Natal. Domini.

chees, who were still a very numerous sect, flying from the provinces, which the barba-

greater part of the ceremonies, used at present by the church of Rome, are evidently condemned, as a wicked profanation of the worship of the true God, since most of them have been borrowed of the pagans, as is notorious, and has been demonstrated, by an eminent writer of our own time. (a) But to return to the Manichees; they taught, that in a combat between the good and the evil principle, the former had been obliged to yield part of its own substance to the latter; that the two natures were mixed together; and that to the mixture of the two natures, the soul of man owed its origin; insomuch that each man had two souls, the one consisting of the substance of the good principle, the other of the substance of the evil. The particles of the good nature were, according to them, in all the beings of this universe, mixed with, and chained to the particles of the evil nature; such however, as happened to be in the food, which they used, were, in being used by them, delivered forever from so painful a bondage. Thus was gluttony, with them, a cardinal virtue, and eating to excess highly meritorious. They rejected the Old Testament, and some parts of the New, especially the Acts of the Apostles; pretending the Old Testament, by reason of the different spirit that appeared in it from that of the New, to have been dictated by the evil principle, and the New to have been, in many places interpolated and corrupted. They denied the mystery of the incarnation, maintaining Christ to have been born, to have suffered and died, only in appearance. They acknowledged no free-will, ascribing all sinful actions to the evil principle, and to the good principle all good actions. They held the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, believing, that even the trees, fruits, herbs, and all other vegetables had souls, by which they were rendered capable of grief and pain. Of this they thought the juice, that issues from them, especially from the fig, when first cut or gathered, and which they called tears, a sufficient proof. Upon this principle, they condemned husbandry and gardening as sinful professions; and used to say, that an usurer was less guilty than a husbandman or gardener. They seem to have entertained the same opinion of a military life, and to have held it unlawful to make war; for on that score Moses was greatly blamed by Faustus, one of the most renowned teachers they ever had: and yet the famous general Sebastian professed their tenets; but he was, probably, only one of their auditors, and not of their elect. To marriage they professed the greatest abhorrence; and to the begetting of children, because the particles of the good principle were, by generation, more streightly united, according to their doctrine, to the particles of the evil. (b) These were, so far as I have been able to gather from the ancients, the fundamental principles of a sect, the most famous, after that of the Arians, of all that ever sprung up in the church.

Their sect consisted of two sorts of persons, namely, of their auditors, or hearers, whom they called "catechumens," and their elect, who were thoroughly instructed in their doctrine, and professed to conform their lives to it. (c) The latter were, by their rule, to abstain from wine, meat, eggs, milk, and fish. Had an elect plucked up but one blade of grass, gathered a single fruit or flower, or pulled a leaf off of a tree, he had been immediately excommunicated, had it been proved, and never re-admitted to their communion. Such was their institution. But St. Austin, who was one of their auditors for the space of nine years, declares, that he never knew one of their elect, who had not been convicted, or at least suspected, of some transgression; he adds, that he had himself informed against some of them, but that he could never prevail upon the rest to take the least notice of his information. (d) They pretended to observe the gospel in the literal and strictest sense, not possessing money, houses or lands; but if we believe St. Austin, (e) though their pockets were empty, their coffers were full. As they held marriage to be sinful, they preached up virginity, acting, in that respect, more agreeably to reason and good

(a) Dr. Middleton, in his "Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism."

(b) Aug. hæ. 46. et in Faust. per tot. Theodoret. hæ. fab. l. 1. c. 26. Arch. p. 196—199, &c.

(c) Aug. hæ. 4.

(d) Aug. de morib. Manich. l. 1. c. 34. et l. 2. c. 19.

(e) Aug. in Faust. l. 5. c. 5.



rians had seized, especially from Africa, after the taking of Carthage, in 439, by Genseric

sense, than their opposers, the catholics, who, owning with the apostles marriage to be honorable in all, yet preached up virginity, and decried marriage, with as much zeal as the Manichees themselves; nay, and excluded from it, in spite of the apostle, great numbers of the one and the other sex. The Manichees had their sacred virgins as well as the catholics; and St. Chrysostom does them the justice to own, that they observed a strict poverty, that they kept their fasts with great rigor; and, what is still more, lived chaste and undefiled. (a) The Manichees abstained from wine, as I have observed above, calling it "the gall of the prince of darkness," but rioted, says Austin, (b) in other liquors, that had the same effect as wine; and in other viands, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, (c) no less pleasing to the palate, than those which they were commanded to forbear. Though it was a crime with them to gather fruit, yet they did not scruple to eat that which others had gathered, nor even to force others to gather it for them. (d) They not only taught, that the particles of the good principle, in the food they used, were redeemed by them from their slavery, flying from their stomachs up to heaven: but held, that the same particles, when used by others, were tied with a new and stronger tie to the evil matter. Hence it was an unpardonable crime with them, and a kind of sacrilege, to let others have any share of the eatables that were given to them; and, therefore, when they had eaten till they could not possibly eat any more, but were upon the point of regorging what they had eaten, they used to cram the children, who were of their sect, till they were ready to burst; nay, they were accused at Rome, of having forced some children to eat, till they actually did burst. (e)

The laws or rules which I have mentioned here, were only binding with respect to their elect. As for their auditors, or catechumens, they were allowed to eat meat, to drink wine, to cultivate the ground, and even to marry, if they chose it, but were, by all means, to avoid the begetting of children, and the killing of any living creature, let the occasion be ever so urgent. (f) Though the Manichees eat to excess, by principle; yet their auditors, as well as their elect, kept two fasts in the week, the one on Sunday, in honor of the sun; and the other on Monday, in honor of the moon. (g) They seem to have admitted baptism; but did not look upon it either as a sacrament, or a necessary ceremony. The great and chief mystery of their sect was their eucharist; and it was in celebrating the eucharist that they committed the abominations, with which the fathers have reproached them. We might indeed suspect the testimony of the fathers, it being well known, that in declaiming against heretics they were apt to exaggerate, and did not always scrupulously adhere to truth. But that the Manichees abandoned themselves, in the celebration of their eucharist, to the most impure and infamous practices, is not only attested by them, but has been often proved by unexceptionable witnesses, nay, and owned by themselves, before the civil magistrates in Italy, in Gaul, in Paphlagonia, and in Africa. To that mystery of iniquity none but their elect were admitted, and what passed on that occasion was concealed with so much secrecy from the rest, that St. Austin, though he had been nine years their auditor, did not even know at what time they used to celebrate their eucharist, or in what place. (h)

As to their hierarchy, they had, in imitation of Christ and his apostles, a college, consisting of thirteen elect, of whom twelve were called "the masters," and the thirteenth "the chief." By the masters their bishops were ordained, and their presbyters and deacons by the bishops. The other elect, as well as the masters, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were employed in instructing their catechumens, propagating their doctrine, and preaching it in the countries, where it had not yet been received. Manes himself had three famous disciples, Hermias, Addas, and Thomas. Her-

(a) Chrys. de virg. c. 4.

(b) Aug. de morib. Manich. c. 16.

(c) Cyril. catech. 6.

(d) Cyril. ibid. Epiph. hær. 66. c. 28.

(e) Aug. de morib. Manich. c. 16, 17.

(f) Aug. contra Lit. Petil. l. 3. c. 17. in Faust. l. 20. c. 23. hær. 46.

(g) Aug. ep. 86.

(h) Aug. in collat. cum Fortunat. Manich. c. 25.

king of the Vandals, had repaired, in great numbers, to Rome, as a place of safety. They did not publicly own their impious doctrine; but, pretending to be catholics, frequented the churches; assisted at the sacred mysteries, and even received the eucharist; so that they not only lived undisturbed, notwithstanding the severe laws that had been enacted against them; but by an external appearance of an extraordinary piety and devotion, gained daily new proselytes to their abominable sect. There were Manichees in Rome when St. Austin went first to that city, that is, in the year 383, for he lodged in the house of a Manichee, and most frequently conversed with those, who professed their doctrine.<sup>1</sup> However, they were obliged, even then, to keep themselves concealed, several severe laws having been published against them before that time. (\*) But though they had lived, and

mias preached his doctrine in Egypt; Addas, called also Adimantus, in Syria; and Thomas in India. They were succeeded by others, who, being sent into different countries, gained every where, and even in Rome, considerable numbers of proselytes: insomuch that Epiphanius, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century, speaks of the Manichees as a famous sect, that had already got footing in many places. (a) And thus much of the origin, tenets, and practices of a sect that has made, for so many ages, so great a noise in the world, and could brag of having once had among its followers one of the brightest lights of the church.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. confess. c. 5.

(\*) Julian, proconsul of Africa, having informed the emperor Dioclesian, that a new religion, brought from Persia, countenanced the greatest abominations, and thereby occasioned great disturbances in the province, the emperors Dioclesian and Maximian, by a rescript dated from Alexandria, the last day of March, 290, commanded the leading men among the Manichees to be burnt alive, and all their writings with them; the persons of quality, who had embraced, or should embrace, their impious doctrine, to be condemned to work in the mines, and the rest to be all beheaded. (b) Valentinian I, in 372, declared all places confiscated, where the Manichees should meet to teach their profane doctrine, ordering, at the same time, their teachers, wherever they should be found, to be punished with the utmost severity. (c) The emperor Gratian, by a law issued in the year 379, granted to Christians of all persuasions the free exercise of their religion, except the Manichees, the Photinians, and the Eunomians. (d) In 381, Theodosius I. declared all Manichees infamous, and incapable of giving or receiving any thing by will, even of inheriting their paternal and maternal estates. (e) This law he confirmed the following year, adding, that those who distinguished themselves from the rest by a particular profession of piety, meaning, no doubt their elect, should be punished with death; and commanding them to be everywhere carefully sought for. In virtue of this law, Messianus, proconsul of Africa, in 389, caused some, whom he had discovered, to be immediately executed. (f) Honorius declared the Manichees in general traitors to the state, and ordered them to be treated as such. (g)

The Manichees were not only persecuted by the Roman emperors, but by other princes too, and with no less severity. Huneric, the son and successor of Genseric, king of the Vandals, in Africa, caused great numbers of their elect to be burnt alive, and drove the rest out of his dominions. (h) They were very numerous in Persia, and in greater repute there than the

(a) Epiph. hær. 66. c. 1.

(b) Bar. ad ann. 287. n. 3.

(c) Cod. Theod. l. 3. p. 113.

(d) Cod. Theod. l. 7. p. 120. Socr. l. 5. c. 2.

(e) Cod. Theod. l. 9. p. 124.

(f) Aug. contra Lit. Petil. l. 3. c. 25.

(g) Cod. Theod. l. 35. p. 152.

(h) Victor Vitensis de perfec. Vandal. l. 2. p. 17.



The Manichees discovered in Rome by Leo. And many of them seized with their bishop. Their abominable mysteries, declared by Leo, in a grand assembly. And owned by them. Some of them converted, others persist in their errors, and are banished. Leo warns all bishops by a circular letter to be upon their guard against them.

exercised their religion in Rome, undiscovered by other popes, they could not long escape the vigilance of Leo; for as he kept a watchful eye over the flock committed to his care, he soon discovered, in some, an uncommon depravation of manners; and inquiring, with great care and application, to what it was owing, he found that there were Manichees in Rome, and that part of his flock was infected with their poisonous doctrines. Upon that discovery, he spared no pains to find them out; and, being informed by some, whom they had attempted to seduce, where they assembled, he caused great numbers of them to be seized, in virtue of the imperial edicts, and among the rest, their bishop, and some of their teachers. Having them thus in his power, his first care was, to learn of them their true tenets, and the secret practices of their sect; which he had no sooner done, than he assembled the neighboring bishops, and those who happened to be then in Rome, with a great number of presbyters; inviting to the assembly, even the laymen of any rank, the great officers of the empire, and the senate. Baronius bestows on this assembly the name of a council;<sup>1</sup> but the emperor styles it only "Leo's audience."<sup>2</sup> Being all met, and in great expectation, Leo ordered the elect of the Manichees, that is, their teachers and chief men among them, to be brought forth. Great was their confusion, when they first appeared before so grand an assembly; but, being encouraged by Leo, they first owned their impious tenets, their superstitious practices, and discovered a crime, which modesty, says Leo, would not allow him even to name; but it was so fully proved, adds he, that the most incredulous were thoroughly satisfied it was true: for all those who had been concerned in that abominable act, were present; namely, a girl twelve years old, the two women who had brought her up, and prepared her for the crime; the youth who debauched her; and the bishop, who presided at that detestable ceremony, and directed it. All agreed, without the least contradiction or variation, in their

depositions; but the act was so abominable in itself, says Leo, that we could hardly bear to hear it, nor can we relate it, without offending the chaste ears of those who hear us. It appeared from the confession, which their bishop made openly, and gave in writing, that they committed those abominations chiefly on their festivals. Of all that passed on this occasion, authentic acts were drawn up, and sent by Leo into all the provinces of the empire, that they might serve for an antidote against the abominable doctrines of that sect.<sup>1</sup> Some of the Manichees, whom Leo had caused to be arrested, abjured their errors; and, having first performed the due penance, were received by him into the church. But against those who continued obstinate, the imperial laws were put into execution, and they condemned to perpetual banishment. They deserved, says Leo, a more severe punishment; but to punish them more severely, was repugnant to the spirit of the church, and to that lenity in which she places her chief glory, abhorring to shed the blood even of the most detestable heretics.<sup>2</sup> How different the spirit of that church is now, those too well know, who have ever had the misfortune to be any ways concerned with that tribunal, of all that ever were heard of, the most cruel and sanguinary, the tribunal of the inquisition. But, even in Leo's time, the lenity of the church was not so very remarkable, as much to be boasted; I do not mean with respect to the Manichees, whose immoralities, if not exaggerated, deserved to be punished with the utmost severity; but with respect to those, who for holding opinions ever so harmless, but not entirely agreeing with the doctrines then in vogue, were stripped of all their effects, driven from their habitations, and condemned to perish for want, in the deserts, or the most inhospitable places of the empire. These punishments, it is true, were inflicted by the imperial edicts and laws, for the church had not yet acquired any temporal power; but they were procured (as is well known) by the rulers of the church, especially by the bishops of Rome; and it was generally speaking, at their request and solicitation, that they were put in execution. As several Manichees found means to make their escape from Rome, Leo took care to warn, by a circular letter, all bishops to be upon their guard against them, to cause them to be seized, when discovered, and to prosecute them without mercy according to the utmost rigor of the imperial laws.<sup>3</sup> Those of that sect, who had been apprehended in Rome, having been forced to declare who were their bishops, who their teachers, and their elect, in the other cities and provinces, they too were all seized, and banished, with the rest, to the most distant parts of the em-

Christians, till the reign of Cabades; and he too countenanced them at first; but the Christians having afterwards gained his favor by a great miracle, which they were supposed to have wrought, he began to persecute the Manichees with great cruelty, and in the year 525, made a general massacre of all who were found in his dominions to profess their doctrine. (a) They met with no better quarter from the Sueves in Spain, from the Franks in Gaul, or the other nations, that settled in the different provinces of the empire. And yet they were, though thus universally detested, abhorred, and persecuted, still a numerous sect in the beginning of the ninth century. The Waldenses, who sprung up in the twelfth century, were stigmatized by their enemies with the odious name of Manichees; but that their doctrine was very different from that of the Manichees, nay, that it was altogether orthodox, I shall show in a more proper place.

(a) Cedren. p. 364. Zonar. l. 3. p. 49. Misc. hist. l. 15. p. 458, 459.

<sup>1</sup> Bar. ad ann. 444.

<sup>2</sup> Leon. op. t. 1. p. 426. et ep. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Prosp. chron. Leo, ep. 8. et 15.

<sup>2</sup> Leo, ep. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Leo, ep. 8. Prosp. chron.



Leo procures a severe law from the emperor against the Manichees. A great conformity between the elect of the Manichees and the monkish orders. The heresy of Priscillian revived in Spain. Turibius of Astorga implores the assistance of Leo to suppress it.

pire. Leo's zeal did not stop here, but applying to the emperor Valentinian III. who was then in Rome, and informing him of the wicked doctrine, and abominable practices of that sect, obtained a law, dated the 19th of June, 445, confirming all the laws enacted against them by his predecessors, and commanding them to be treated as sacrilegious persons, banishing them from the cities, excluding them from all employments both civil and military, declaring them incapable of giving or receiving any thing by will or testament, of suing any one at law, or making any contract; and ordering all persons to inform against them, without being bound, in giving their information, to observe the usual forms of the law.<sup>1</sup> But the Manichees were so far from being retrieved from their errors by the severity of these laws, that they gloried in them, as St. Austin informs us,<sup>2</sup> and boasting that they suffered for the sake of justice, the more they suffered, the more obstinately they adhered to the doctrine for which they suffered. That Leo did not extirpate this wicked sect, as his panegyrists pretended that he did, is very certain; for, not to mention other countries, where they were very numerous long after his death, in the latter end of the sixth century, many, who professed their doctrine, were discovered in Sicily, though one of the suburbicarian provinces, and immediately subject to the see of Rome, nay, on the very lands belonging to that see, nor could Gregory the Great, notwithstanding the pains he took, drive them quite out of the island.<sup>3</sup> In the ninth century their doctrine obtained, almost universally, in the two provinces of Lycaonia and Phrygia, being greatly countenanced by the emperor Nicephorus.<sup>4</sup> But soon after his death they seem to have failed of themselves, no farther mention being made of them in history.

The reader must have observed<sup>5</sup> a wonderful conformity, with respect to abstinence from meats, between the elect among the Manichees and the monkish orders. For some of them abstain by rule, as the Manichees did, not only from meat, and every thing that comes from meat, but from all sorts of fish too, choosing rather to die than to taste any kind of animal food, though prescribed as the best, and sometimes as the only means of saving their lives. The abstinence of the Manichees was in some degree more rational than that of the monks; for they abstained from such food only as, in their opinion, proceeded from the evil principle, to whom they ascribed a dominion equal with that of God, or had in its mixture a greater number of the evil particles than of the good; and was therefore held by them to be unclean. But, to be-

lieve that so many good things have been given us by God for our use and pleasure, yet think it criminal, as the founders of some of the monkish orders have done, ever to use them, or meritorious constantly to abstain from them, is not only absurd and ridiculous, but wicked and blasphemous, since it can be only owing to a notion highly injurious to God, as if he took delight in vexing and tormenting his creatures, or seeing them vex and torment themselves. Had they not better acknowledge, with the Manichees, a good and bad principle, than thus transform, with their heathenish notions, the good principle into a bad one?

It was not against the Manichees alone, that Leo exercised his zeal for the purity of the faith. In his time the Priscillianists, of whom I have spoken elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> were grown very numerous in Spain, the long wars between the Romans and the barbarians, who entered that province in 409, having given them an opportunity of propagating their doctrine, without the least check either from the spiritual or the temporal power. When the troubles were somewhat composed, Turibius, bishop of Astorga, apprehending that the church had suffered by the late distractions, as much as the state, the better to inform himself of the disorders that might have crept in during the war, undertook a visitation throughout the province. On this occasion he discovered, to his great surprise, the extraordinary progress which the doctrine of Priscillian, however infamous, had insensibly made in most churches, especially in those of Galicia, which at this time was subject to the Sueves. In some places it was countenanced by the bishops themselves; at least they could not be prevailed upon to join their colleagues in the vigorous measures suggested by Turibius to suppress it. He therefore had recourse to Leo, giving him a particular account of the doctrine taught by the Priscillianists, (\*) and

<sup>1</sup> See p. 112.

(\*) He reduces their whole doctrine to the following articles: 1. That the spiritual beings proceed from the essence of God. 2. That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are but one person. 3. That Jesus Christ is the Son of God, merely because he was born of a virgin. 4. That all ought to fast on Christmas day, and on Sundays. 5. That the evil spirits were never good; that they were not created by God, but formed out of the chaos and darkness. 6. That marriage is unlawful, and the begetting of children highly criminal. 7. That our bodies were formed by the devil, and are not to rise from the dead. 8. That the elect are born of women, but conceived of the Holy Ghost. 9. That our souls were created in heaven, but confined to our bodies, by way of punishment for the crimes they had committed. 10. That the planets and stars govern all things by an unavoidable fatality. This summary of their doctrine was, by Turibius, extracted out of their own books, and sent by him to Leo. (a) In practice they did not much differ from the Manichees, the same, or almost the same, infamous mysteries being common to both; for, in the trial of Priscillian before the emperor Maximus, it appeared, that he had countenanced all manner of debauchery, that he had held nocturnal assemblies of lewd women, and that he used to pray naked among them.

(a) Conct. t. 4. p. 1737. Leon. op. t. 1. p. 460.

<sup>1</sup> Leon. op. t. 1. p. 426, 427.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. in Faust. l. 5. c. 1. <sup>3</sup> Greg. l. 2. ep. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Miscel. hist. l. 24. p. 779. Zonar. t. 3. p. 100.

<sup>5</sup> See note, p. 194.



Priscillian anathematised, and his doctrine condemned by two councils in Spain. The doctrine of Eutyches begins to make a great noise in the church. Who Eutyches was. His doctrine. Charged with teaching doctrines which he never taught.

implored his assistance against the spreading evil. Leo in his answer commends the zeal of Turibius; condemns the doctrine of Priscillian, as impious and detestable; and declares all who tolerate heresies no less guilty than those who embrace them. Agreeably to this, in the same letter he approves of the death of Priscillian and some of his disciples, formerly executed by an order from Maximus, who had usurped the sovereignty of Gaul.<sup>1</sup> On this letter of Leo, F. Maimbourg lays great stress to prove, that heresy is a capital crime, and may be justly punished with death;<sup>2</sup> as if the authority of Leo could counterbalance that of the gospel, discountenancing all kinds of persecution, and recommending mercy even towards those who rejected our Savior in person, because he "came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

Indeed, the crimes ascribed to Priscillian and his adherents, were such as merited death from the civil laws, and were only more dangerous by being perpetrated under a notion of religion; so that the punishing them, in any manner, was not persecution; but Leo's doctrine extended to such religious opinions as, though erroneous, did not impel those who held them, to commit any crimes, and with which, therefore, the civil magistrate had nothing to do: this is properly persecution; and the want of attending to this plain distinction, is what has sometimes led even good men to favor that practice, so contrary to reason, and the gospel of Christ.

Leo, with his answer to Turibius, sent into Spain a circular letter to all the bishops of that province, earnestly entreating, or rather commanding them, to assemble, without delay, a general council, or if that could not be conveniently done, at least a provincial synod, and there, by condemning the doctrine of Priscillian, clear themselves in the eyes of the world, from all suspicion of their adhering to, or conniving at, his errors. In compliance with his desire or command, two councils were held, the one at Toledo, the other at Braga, then the metropolis of Galicia; and in both Priscillian was anathematized with his doctrine, and all who received or approved it; seventeen articles were drawn up to be signed by all bishops, on pain of deposition, and such measures taken, at the suggestion of Leo, as put an immediate stop to the growth of that heresy, and would have utterly suppressed it, if they had been more steadily pursued.<sup>3</sup>

[Year of Christ 448.] But the doctrine of Eutyches, which began about this time to make a great noise in the east, opened a larger field for the zeal of Leo, than the exploded heresies of Priscillian or Manes. Eutyches was a monk, and abbot of a monastery of three

hundred monks, in the neighborhood of Constantinople, where he had led a chaste and continent life, for the space of seventy years, as he himself declared in a letter, which he wrote this very year. He had even taken a resolution of never setting his foot out of the doors of his monastery, but upon the most urgent occasions. He was, after Cyril, the most inveterate enemy Nestorius had, and therefore one of that prelate's chief favorites; for to him, though no bishop, Cyril sent, as a token of his friendship, a copy of the acts of the council of Ephesus. He used to brag, that he was grown hoary in combating heresies, and defending the faith. When Nestorius first broached his doctrine, he did not scruple to quit his monastery, notwithstanding the resolution he had taken to live ever shut up in it as in his tomb, and repair to court, in order to prejudice the emperor, so far as in him lay, against the pretended heresiarch. He was looked upon by those of his own party, that is, by the Egyptians, and the other enemies of Nestorius, and the orientals, as a man of extraordinary sanctity; and, in the instruction which Epiphanius, archdeacon of Alexandria, sent to Maximian, bishop of Constantinople, he is styled, "the holy and most reverend Eutyches."<sup>1</sup> As to his parts, he is said to have had little knowledge, and to have been very slow of apprehension. Pope Leo ascribes his errors not to malice, but ignorance, styling him an "old, imprudent, and ignorant dotard;"<sup>2</sup> and F. Petau paints him as a man of stupid and unsettled mind.<sup>3</sup> However, he seems to have been better acquainted with the subtleties then in vogue, than most of those who opposed him.

As to the doctrine he taught, it may be reduced to the two following heads: 1. That as there was but one Christ, so there was but one nature in Christ. 2. That this nature consisted of the human and the divine natures, become one by the hypostatical union. This he maintained to be the genuine doctrine of Cyril, and entirely agreeable to an expression which that father had frequently used, "The one incarnate nature of the word." And truly it would be no easy task to prove the doctrine of Eutyches heretical, and, at the same time, admit the expression of Cyril as orthodox, which some have attempted to do, as we shall see hereafter. That the soul of Christ had been created in heaven, and had remained there till the time of the incarnation; that his body was of a different substance from ours, not taken of the Virgin Mary, but brought from heaven; that Christ had been once a mere man, but was become God, by being united to the divine nature; that the Divinity itself had suffered, and been crucified; were no part of his doctrine, but only

<sup>1</sup> See p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Maimb. hist. du Pontificat de St. Leon, l. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Leo, ep. 15. Leon. op. t. 1. p. 459. Concil. t. 2. p. 1227. et t. 5. p. 837.

<sup>1</sup> Leo, ep. 52. Liberat. c. 11. Prosp. chron. Concil. t. 4. p. 273—275.

<sup>2</sup> Leo, ep. 24. 26, 27. { <sup>3</sup> Pet. dog. t. 4. l. 1. c. 14.



The orientals declare against his doctrine, and declare it heretical. The Egyptians, in opposition to the orientals, declare for it. Domnus of Antioch, at the head of the orientals. His character, and the character of Dioscorus of Alexandria, who headed the Egyptians. His pride, ambition, and tyrannical government.

inferences drawn from it by his enemies, and denied by him. He even admitted of two natures in Christ, the human and the divine; but these two natures, by being united, were, according to him, in an ineffable manner, become one, there being, as he often repeated, but one Christ, and not two. His meaning, therefore, was certainly orthodox; for he meant no more than that there was but one Christ; and this catholic truth he thought could be no otherwise maintained than by supposing, that the two natures were become one, in a manner which he did not comprehend, nor pretend to explain. But it was not his doctrine alone, or rather his expressions, that gave offence; he was charged with speaking contemptuously of the fathers, nay, with having called them heretics, and having, on a certain occasion, declared, that he did not take them, but the holy scripture, for his guide; and that he was satisfied with studying the scripture, without troubling himself about the opinions and sentiments of the fathers.<sup>1</sup> A heinous crime indeed!

As Eutyches had greatly disoblged the orientals, that is, the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, charging them with Nestorianism, because they would not admit the expressions of Cyril, and had even procured from the emperor Theodosius II., with whom he was in great favor, an edict, driving several of them from their sees, and sending them into exile, he no sooner began to teach his doctrine, than they, all to a man, declared against it. Domnus, the nephew and successor of John, in the see of Antioch, put himself at the head of the party; and having assembled a council without loss of time, it was there declared, with one consent, that the doctrine of Eutyches was the same with that of Apollinaris, and altogether incapable of being understood, or expounded, in a catholic sense. Before they broke up, to lessen the credit of Eutyches at court, they wrote to the emperor, informing him of what had passed, and giving him a particular account of the pretended errors of the new heresiarch.<sup>2</sup> To this letter the emperor returned no answer, nor did he take the least notice of the charge it contained, ascribing it, perhaps, to what it may be but too truly ascribed to, a spirit of revenge.

In the mean time, Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril in the see of Alexandria, hearing that the orientals had declared against Eutyches, thought that a sufficient motive to declare in his favor. For the ancient animosities between the Egyptians and the orientals still subsisted, and the latter had but very lately sided with the bishop of Constantinople in a dispute between him and Dioscorus about jurisdiction. The bishops of Egypt all ranged themselves under the banner of their patriarch, and with them a whole army of monks, zeal-

ous in the defence of one of their own profession, though, generally speaking, utterly unacquainted with the merits of the cause. And thus, after a few years of a very precarious and unsettled peace, was war again openly declared between the two rival patriarchs and their suffragans; a war, which did not end as the other ecclesiastical wars, which I have hitherto had occasion to mention, in councils only, and the result of councils, curses, anathemas, depositions, exiles; but in slaughter and bloodshed, one of the most eminent prelates of his age having lost his life in the quarrel: and all this for words or expressions, in speaking of a mystery, which neither party understood, or pretended to explain.

The heads of the two opposite parties, Domnus and Dioscorus, were but ill matched. Domnus, who had spent a great part of his life in the desert, was a man of a mild disposition, and very slender parts; had little knowledge, less resolution, and no foresight to avoid difficulties, or address to extricate himself out of those which he could not avoid.<sup>1</sup> Dioscorus, on the contrary, was a prelate of excellent parts, of great subtlety, penetration, and address, well versed in most branches of learning, and no less distinguished by an apparent piety before his elevation, than he was by an apparent moderation for some time after it. Leo styles him, in one of his letters, "a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost;"<sup>2</sup> and another very eminent writer of that time paints him as a man who despised all worldly grandeur, and was wholly intent upon securing a place for himself in the kingdom of heaven.<sup>3</sup> But he soon changed, or rather pulled off the mask, when it could serve no end to wear it any longer, and swelled with pride, in seeing himself raised to so high a station, and vested with so much power, he committed such excesses in the use of it, as procured him the surname of Dioscorus the Tyrant.<sup>4</sup> As the see of Alexandria had been held for the space of threescore years by one family, that of Cyril, the bishops had, by the indulgence of the emperors, the connivance of the governors unwilling to quarrel with them, and the support of the monks, and their own relations, whom they had enriched with the ecclesiastical revenues, greatly encroached on the secular power, and made themselves, in a manner, sovereigns of that city. But Dioscorus carried his usurpations far beyond the bounds, at which the most ambitious of his predecessors, even Cyril himself, had thought it advisable to stop. For without any regard to the governors, who represented the emperor, and acted in his place, he imprisoned, fined, and even condemned to banishment, all whom

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 193. Leo, ep. 24, 25. 27. 59. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Facund. l. 12. c. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 727. Bolland. 20. Jan. p. 308.

<sup>2</sup> Leo ep. 11. c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret. ep. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 414.



He persecutes the relations of Cyril. Applies to his own use what was given and designed for the support of the poor. He treats the Alexandrians with great cruelty. Is supported at court by the eunuch Chrysaphius. Acts as sovereign of all Egypt. Eutyches opens his mind, and owns his doctrine to Eusebius of Dorylæum. Who treats him as a heretic. And charges him with heresy, before Flavianus of Constantinople.

he disliked, or who seemed to dislike him. He began with the relations of his predecessor, whom he stripped of the immense wealth they possessed, and reduced to beggary, pretending they had been enriched with the revenues of the church, the patrimony of the poor.<sup>1</sup> And indeed this charge seems not to have been groundless; at least Cyril gave reason to think it was not; for by his will he bequeathed a very considerable sum to his successor, conjuring him not to molest his relations: and why should he have been under any apprehension that his successor would molest them, had he not known that the wealth they were possessed of belonged, at least in part, to the church, and might be claimed by his successors? However that may be, while Dioscorus was thus prosecuting the relations of Cyril, under pretence that they had been enriched with what he called the patrimony of the poor, he was enriching himself with what truly was the patrimony of the poor; for a lady of great distinction, named Peristeria, having bequeathed a very large sum to the hospitals, and the poor of Egypt, he seized the whole for himself; nay, and caused the corn, which was given yearly by the emperor for the support of the poor Christians in Libya, where no corn grew, to be conveyed into his own granaries; and there kept it, while they were starving, till a year of great dearth, when he sold it at most exorbitant prices, without bestowing a single grain on the poor, for whose use it was given.<sup>2</sup> His conduct, with respect to the people of Alexandria, was that of a perfect tyrant; for he did not scruple, upon the least provocation, to seize by force on their estates, to cause their houses to be set on fire, their trees to be cut down, their pleasant gardens to be destroyed, and such of them as were most obnoxious to him, to be sometimes privately, and sometimes publicly, murdered by a band of ruffians, whom he kept constantly in his pay; insomuch that had not Theodorus, then governor of Egypt, from time to time, ventured to check him, and flattered the people with the hopes of a speedy redress, he would, in a very short time, have turned that populous city into a desert.<sup>3</sup> He was powerfully supported at court, by the eunuch Chrysaphius, who had an entire ascendant over the emperor, and a large share in the spoils of the Alexandrians; and it was on that consideration, that the governor did not choose to break with the bishop; being sensible, that he would thereby hurt, if not entirely ruin, his own fortune, without bettering the condition of the people. However, by his good offices in behalf of the citizens, and his great complaisance and condescending behaviour to-

wards Dioscorus, he had the satisfaction of saving the estates, and even the lives, of many, whom the cruel and avaricious prelate had destined to death or beggary. Dioscorus was so elated with the extraordinary deference and respect the governor paid him, that, blind with pride and ambition, he began to look upon himself as sovereign of Alexandria, and king of all Egypt; insomuch that he caused those who, upon the death of Theodosius II., came to Alexandria to proclaim Marcian in his room, to be driven out of the city, for presuming to proclaim another emperor in Egypt while he was alive.<sup>1</sup> Thus much of the character and conduct of a man whom I shall have frequent occasion to mention in the sequel, as the chief author of the disturbances I am to relate, and the evils attending them. And now to resume the thread of the history.

The emperor, as I have related above, returned no answer to the letter of Domnus, and the other orientals, charging Eutyches with heretical opinions concerning the incarnation. But, in the mean time, Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia, being informed that Eutyches taught a new doctrine, which had given great offence to the orientals, resolved to learn of Eutyches himself his true sentiments; for, as to the orientals, he knew them to be greatly prejudiced against him, and therefore capable of having been swayed, in censuring his opinion, with passion and revenge. Pursuant to this resolution, he had several private conferences with Eutyches, who opened his mind to him with great freedom and candor, not thinking that any exception could be made against his doctrine, by one who had defended Cyril, and opposed Nestorius, with so much zeal as Eusebius had done. But, to his great surprise, he found him so shocked at the bare mention of "one nature in Christ," that, instead of allowing him room to explain or defend his opinion, he began to treat him as a heretic, and exhort him to abjure such an impious tenet, lest, by obstinately defending it, he should involve both the church and himself in endless troubles. Eutyches, unmoved by his exhortations, maintained his doctrine to be the pure doctrine of Cyril, and his expressions to be entirely agreeable to the expressions of that father, which had been approved by the council of Ephesus. Eusebius, finding his exhortations and remonstrances made no impression on the mind of Eutyches, resolved to apply to Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, and arraign him of heresy at his tribunal. Flavianus had assembled several bishops to examine a judgment that had been given by the metropolitan of Lydia, against two of his suffragans. At that assembly as-

<sup>1</sup> Liberat. c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 399—402.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 395—399.



Flavianus unwilling to receive the accusation; but receives it, and summons Eutyches to appear before the council then sitting. He appears and owns his doctrine. Is anathematized by the whole council. Refuses to retract his doctrine; and is condemned, and deposed. He appeals to an oecumenical council, and writes to Leo. His doctrine taught by two popes.

sisted Eusebius among the rest, who, rising from his seat, when the business was despatched, for which they had met, presented unexpectedly a memorial, requiring them to summon Eutyches, and oblige him to give an account of his faith, and answer the charge of heresy, which he was ready to prove against him. Flavianus was not a little alarmed at this accusation. Eutyches was in great credit at court; Chrysaphius, the reigning eunuch, professed a particular friendship for him; the Egyptians, with Dioscorus, whom every man dreaded, at their head, had declared in his favor; and the orientals, who had condemned him in their synod, were, on that very score, thought by the emperor still to adhere to the doctrine of Nestorius. Upon these considerations Flavianus was for leaving the orientals to pursue the accusation they had begun, in what manner they pleased, without taking part either with them against Eutyches, or with the Egyptians in his favor. He therefore pressed Eusebius, with great earnestness, to drop his accusation, or at least to defer it to a more proper season, but to no effect: Eusebius, in spite of all he could say, still insisted upon his memorial being registered, and Eutyches summoned to give an account of his faith. Flavianus, finding him unalterable in his resolution, complied in the end with his request; and Eutyches was accordingly summoned to appear, on an appointed day, before the council, and there answer the charge brought against him by the bishop of Dorylæum. He refused to obey the first and the second summons, pleading the resolution he had taken, never to set foot out of his monastery; but complied with the third, finding the council was determined to proceed against him according to the canons, if he did not, that is, to excommunicate and degrade him from the priesthood. The day appointed for his appearance in the last summons, was the 22d of November; and on that day he appeared accordingly; but surrounded and guarded by a great number of monks, officers, and soldiers, not knowing to what extremities the fathers of the council might suffer themselves to be carried by their great zeal for what they called the purity of the faith. Being admitted, and examined on several articles relating to the mystery of the incarnation, he returned such answers to the questions that were put to him, as fully satisfied the whole assembly. But being at last pressed by Florentius, metropolitan of Sardes, to declare, without ambiguity, and in the plainest terms, his real sentiments concerning the nature of Christ, he confessed, with great candor, that he acknowledged two natures before the union, and but one after it.

At these words the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present

striving to distinguish himself above the rest, by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest. When the tumult and noise began to abate, Flavianus, addressing Eutyches, let him know, that unless he acknowledged two natures after the union as well as before it, and anathematized all who held the contrary opinion, he should be obliged to proceed against him according to the canons. Eutyches replied, that he believed Christ to be perfect God and perfect man; that nothing more had been required by the fathers of Nice and Ephesus; that he had read in St. Cyril, in St. Athanasius, and in the other fathers, of two natures in Christ, abstracting from the union or incarnation, but in none the least hint that could countenance the doctrine of the two natures after the union; but nevertheless that he was ready to confess them, should the bishops of Rome and Alexandria desire or command it. This was plainly appealing to those two bishops; but the fathers of the council, without taking the least notice of such an appeal, no doubt because they did not think it worthy of their notice, proceeded to the sentence, and declared Eutyches fully convicted of having revived the heresies of Valentine and Appollinaris, and therefore degraded from the sacerdotal dignity, cut off from the communion of the church, deprived of the government of his monastery; and all, who for the future should converse with him, were in like manner separated from the communion of the faithful. This sentence was signed by thirty-two bishops, and twenty-three abbots.<sup>1</sup>

Eutyches, seeing himself thus condemned by the council, appealed from their sentence to the patriarchs of Rome, of Alexandria, of Jerusalem, to the bishop of Thessalonica, and other bishops, that is, to an oecumenical council. At the same time, he wrote a long letter to Leo, informing him of his having been condemned by the council of Constantinople, which he ascribed to the intrigues of his avowed enemy, Eusebius, of Dorylæum, assuring him, that he held none of the errors for which he had been condemned, but sincerely anathematized the doctrine of Valentine and Appollinaris; and complaining, in the strongest terms, of the conduct of Flavianus, who, he said, had condemned him, without allowing him to explain his doctrine, or deigning to read a confession of faith, which he had presented to the council. In the same letter he not only owns his opinion, without the least dissimulation or disguise; but alleges several passages out of the fathers, and some from two of Leo's predecessors, Felix and Julius, to confirm it. The words of Julius, as quoted by him out of one of that pope's letters, are as follows: "It must not be said that there are two

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 220—243. Liberat. c. 11.



He applies to the emperor, for the assembling of an oecumenical council. The emperor, unwilling to assemble a council, strives to reconcile Eutyches and Flavianus. Flavianus will hearken to no terms. The council summoned. Leo invited to attend. His answer to the emperor's invitation. The instructions given by the emperor to his commissioners. Leo condemns the doctrine of Eutyches. His famous letter to Flavianus.

natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul form but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity form but one nature in Christ."<sup>1</sup> The very doctrine of Eutyches. Indeed the advocates for infallibility will not allow that letter to be genuine; but none of them have been yet able to prove it supposititious: and it is not at all probable that Eutyches, in writing to Leo, would have quoted a letter of one of his predecessors, who had lived but in the preceding century, had he not known it to be genuine. At least Leo never reproached him with quoting writings that were not genuine, but only with ignorantly misinterpreting the fathers he quoted.

Eutyches could hardly believe, that Leo would condemn a doctrine that had been taught, in the plainest terms, by one of his predecessors. However, not to depend entirely upon his judgment, as he had great interest at court, he applied at the same time to the emperor, for the assembling of an oecumenical council. Theodosius had nothing more at heart than the peace of the church; and no prince was ever more ready to concur in the measures that were thought the most proper to produce or to maintain it. But he knew by experience, that the assembling of councils was, of all others, the least proper for the attaining of so desirable an end; and therefore, notwithstanding the great regard he had for Eutyches, he rejected, at first, his request, being determined to try whether he could not, by some other means, divert the storm which he saw, with great concern, beginning to gather. The means he chose was, to mediate a reconciliation between Eutyches and Flavianus, and persuade the former to make some submissions to his bishop, and the latter to accept them, and restore Eutyches to the government of his monastery, and the communion of the church. With this view, he sent a friendly message to Flavianus, exhorting, and even condescending to beg him to be satisfied with the symbol of Nice, without perplexing himself with subtleties and distinctions, concerning a mystery which he could not pretend to understand or explain. But Flavianus could by no entreaties be prevailed upon to hearken to the proposal; so that Theodosius was obliged, in the end, to have recourse to a council; and accordingly, by a circular letter, dated the 30th of March, 449, he summoned all the heads of the diocesses in his dominions to meet at Ephesus, on the first of August, each of them with ten metropolitans, and the like number of other bishops, under their jurisdiction:<sup>2</sup> so that the bishops who assisted at this council must in all have been one hundred and twenty, the eastern empire consisting, at this time, of six diocesses, namely, Egypt, the east, properly so called, or the patriarchate

of Antioch, Asia, Pontus, Thrace, and Illyricum. At the same time, the emperor wrote to Leo, acquainting him with the resolution he had taken of assembling an oecumenical council, with the place and time, at which it was to meet; and inviting him to it, in order to concur with his brethren in examining a difficulty, in point of faith, that had been lately started. Leo, in his answer to this letter, commended the zeal which the emperor had shown, on all occasions, for the purity of the faith, and the peace of the church; but begged he might be excused from attending in person, since the affairs of his own church required his presence, and, besides, none of his predecessors had ever assisted in person at councils held out of Italy. However, he promised to send legates, who should act in his name; and the persons he chose for that purpose were, Julius, bishop of Puteoli, now Pozzoli, Renatus, and Hilarius, the former presbyter, and the latter deacon, of the Roman church, and afterward his successor in that see. These he styles, and it is the first time the pope's legates were so styled, legates "*de latere suo*,"<sup>1</sup> that is, belonging to the church of Rome, or under her immediate jurisdiction.

Theodosius, having thus summoned the bishops to Ephesus, despatched thither Elpidius, one of his privy council, and Eulogius, secretary of state, with an order for the proconsul of Asia to assist them, with all the troops under his command, in maintaining the public peace, and keeping the city quiet, while the council was sitting. Their private instructions were, to assist at the council, and suffer nothing to be transacted there rashly, and without due deliberation; to take into arrest, without distinction, or regard to their rank, such as should attempt to raise disturbances in the council; to oblige those, by whom Eutyches had been condemned, to be present at the council, but not allow them to vote, since the council was assembled chiefly to examine the judgment which they had given; and lastly, to transmit to court a distinct and impartial account of every thing that should be proposed, debated, or transacted in the council.<sup>2</sup>

In the mean time, Leo, being informed by Flavianus, of what had passed in the council of Constantinople, highly approved of the proceedings and decisions of that assembly, openly declared against Eutyches, condemned his doctrine as heretical and blasphemous, and strictly enjoined his legates, at their setting out for the east, to agree in all things, and act in concert with the bishop of Constantinople, whose faith he knew to be orthodox. He answered that prelate by a letter, which is deemed one of the most valuable monuments of antiquity, and is thought to

<sup>1</sup> Lup. coll. c. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 101—104.

<sup>1</sup> Leo, ep. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 108.



Several other letters written by Leo, on this occasion. Chrysologus' answer to Eutyches. The council meets at Ephesus. The order in which they sat.

have contributed more than any thing else, to the great fame and reputation which he afterwards acquired. For he there explains at length, and with all the perspicuity the subject can bear, the doctrine of the church, concerning the mystery of the incarnation, and alleges from the scripture, and the fathers, all that can be said to confirm it. This letter was afterwards received by the oecumenical council of Chalcedon, and by all the bishops of the catholic church; nay, in the western churches it was constantly read, during the advent, together with the gospel. The council of Rome, under Gelasius, anathematized all who should reject but a single word it contained;<sup>1</sup> and Gregory the Great would allow none to be truly orthodox, who did not admit the definitions of the four first oecumenical councils, and Leo's letter.<sup>2</sup> It was received by the council of Apamea about the year 535, and styled by the fathers of that assembly, "the true column of the orthodox faith."<sup>3</sup> Some even caused it to be read to them at the point of death, to show that they died in the faith of the church.<sup>4</sup> But what reception it met with from the present council, we shall see hereafter.

Leo wrote several other letters on this occasion, all bearing the same date with that to Flavianus, the 13th of June, 449, namely, one to the emperor Theodosius, one to the empress Pulcheria, one to the abbots of Constantinople, and one to the council.<sup>5</sup> These letters were all calculated to prove the doctrine of the two natures, to confute the opposite opinion, and to encourage those, to whom they were addressed, to contribute, so far as in them lay, towards extinguishing the flame, which Eutyches had ignorantly kindled. For Leo constantly ascribes the errors of Eutyches to his ignorance; and speaks of him in his letters, as a man altogether incapable of understanding either the catholic system, or his own. These letters were all delivered to the legates, who set out for Ephesus about the latter end of June.

Eutyches had not written to Leo alone, but, at the same time, to all the bishops of the chief sees in the west; and among the rest, to the famous Petrus Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna: and that Prelate returned him the following answer; that he was greatly surprised to hear of disputes about a point, that should no more be questioned than the incarnation itself; that as to the quarrel between him and Flavianus, he was not sufficiently informed to determine who was in the right, and who in the wrong, having heard but one party; that if any thing relating to the faith still remained undecided, the desire he had of maintaining the peace and unity of the church, engaged him to decide it jointly with

the bishop of Rome, and not by his own authority alone; and therefore, he could only advise him to hearken, with submission, to the doctrine which that bishop had already declared in his writings.<sup>1</sup> On this letter some of the advocates of the see of Rome have laid great stress; as if Chrysologus had thought it unlawful in any case whatever, for a bishop to judge in matters of faith, without the consent of the bishop of Rome. But surely, they can by no prejudice be so blinded, as not to see, that Chrysologus speaks here, only with respect to the present case; and that, in the present case, it had been great temerity in him, and contrary to the union and concord, that ought to reign among bishops, to have set up for a judge, or even to have delivered his opinion, without consulting the first bishop of the catholic church, who was near at hand, and to whom Eutyches had appealed, as well as to him. Besides, what right had the bishop of Ravenna to judge, without the consent and concurrence of Leo, and his other brethren in the west, to whom Eutyches had appealed, a cause that had been already judged and determined by a whole council? Leo himself was an utter stranger to the doctrine which the friends of his see endeavor to prove from the letter of Chrysologus; for though no pope was ever more jealous than he of the authority of St. Peter's throne, as he styled it, yet he never found fault with Flavianus for judging and condemning Eutyches, without either his consent or his knowledge. I might add, that the bishops of Ravenna were bound, on a particular account, to act in concert with, and in some kind of dependence upon the see of Rome, since it was chiefly by the interest of the bishops of Rome, that their city was raised, about this very time, to the rank of a metropolis, and they vested with the metropolitan jurisdiction.

The council had been appointed to meet on the first of August, as I have related above; but they did not assemble till the 8th of that month, when they met, for the first time, in the great church, where the first council of Ephesus had been held eighteen years before. They were in all one hundred and forty-nine, counting the bishops who assisted in person, and the deputies of those who did not. Dioscorus presided, by the emperor's express order, seated on a high throne. Julius of Puteoli, the pope's first legate, held the second place; Domnus of Antioch was placed after Juvenalis of Jerusalem, and Flavianus of Constantinople after both. To the deacon Hilarius, Leo's other legate, and Dulcitius, notary of the Roman church, was assigned the last place of all. As for Renatus, the pope's second legate, he died in the island of Cos, on his way to Ephesus.<sup>2</sup> Flavianus,

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 1263.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. 1. 5. ep. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 5. p. 101.

<sup>4</sup> Vigil. Tapsens. in Eutych. p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> Leo, ep. 26, 27, 28, 29.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 1. ante Concil. Chalced.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 251. 254.



Flavianus, and the bishops of his party, excluded from voting. Leo's letter to the council not read. Eutyches presents a confession of faith to the council; which is approved; and all are anathematized, who maintained the two natures. Eutyches absolved and restored. Flavianus, and Eusebius of Dorylæum, deposed. Hilarius, the pope's legate, protests against the sentence.

and the other bishops, who, jointly with him, had condemned Eutyches in the council of Constantinople, were declared parties, and, as such, excluded from voting in the present council. This, however consonant to justice, was contrary to the practice of the church; for Alexander, and the other bishops of Egypt, who had condemned Arius, were nevertheless allowed to vote in the council of Nice, assembled to examine their judgment, and his doctrine; and a few years before, Cyril, and the bishops of his diocese, were admitted among the judges of Nestorius, though they had already condemned him in a national synod.

The bishops being seated, and the emperor's letter for the calling of the council read, according to custom, Hilarius presented Leo's letter to the council, and Dioscorus ordered it to be received and read. But the notary, who was ordered to read it, not having immediately complied with the order, and some disputes arising in the mean time, it was laid aside, and no more thought of. Some of the bishops, and among the rest Julius the legate, were for examining in the first place, and settling the point of faith in dispute; but it being carried by a great majority, that Eutyches should be first heard, he was called in, and ordered to give an account of his faith. In compliance with that order, he presented a confession of faith, declaring that he held the doctrine of Nice, with that of Cyril, as approved by the council of Ephesus, and sincerely anathematized Manes, Valentine, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and all who had been condemned by the church, from the time of Simon the magician, to the present. This confession being read, Flavianus rising up, desired that Eusebius of Dorylæum, his accuser, might be likewise heard; and this motion was seconded by the legates. But Elpidius and Eulogius, who assisted at the council in the emperor's name, let them know, that they had been called together, not to judge Eutyches anew, but those who had judged him; and therefore that their only business was, to examine the acts of the council of Constantinople; which was done accordingly, without the least disturbance, to the seventh session, where Eusebius of Dorylæum was said to have pressed Eutyches to acknowledge two natures in Christ after the incarnation. But when that passage was read, the same tumult and uproar was raised in the present council, against Eusebius, for requiring two natures to be owned in Christ, as had been raised against Eutyches in the former, for refusing to own them; nay, and in part, by the same prelates. "Let Eusebius be burned alive," they all cried out with one voice; "let him be cut asunder; as he divides, so may he be divided." Dioscorus, not satisfied with these confused cries, desired, that those who could not raise their voices so as to be heard, should lift up their hands, in token of their concurring with the rest in ana-

thematizing the doctrine of the two natures. His voice, his threatening mien, the presence of the soldiers, the menaces of the monks, who were more dreaded than the soldiers themselves, and had surrounded the place where the council was held, struck such a terror into the whole assembly, that, lifting up their hands, they all joined, as one man, in crying out aloud, "whoever admits of two natures, let him be anathematized, let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred."<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of Eutyches being thus declared orthodox, he was not only restored, with one consent, to the communion of the church, and the government of his monastery, but by all extolled with the most pompous and fulsome encomiums on his courage in daring to teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the fathers; and on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before.<sup>2</sup> I do not find, that either Flavianus, or the legates, offered to oppose the restoration of Eutyches, or spoke a single word in defence of the sentence pronounced against him by the council of Constantinople.

Dioscorus, finding the prelates thus intimidated, and himself, through their pusillanimity, absolute master of the council, thought this a favorable opportunity of crushing at once all the enemies of Eutyches, and resolved to use it. He began with Flavianus, and Eusebius of Dorylæum; and pretending that they had acted contrary to a decree of the first council of Ephesus, (\*) the one in accusing Eutyches, and the other in condemning him, he declared them both, in virtue of that decree, anathematized and deposed. Flavianus, in hearing the sentence, appealed from Dioscorus, saying, "I except against you," (παραισμαι ὅς); and he said no more, but delivered his appeal, in writing, to the pope's legates.<sup>3</sup> (†) Victor, of Tunes, Theodoret, and Leo himself, write, that the legates opposed the deposition of Flavianus with great intrepidity, and protested aloud against the injustice of the sentence.<sup>4</sup> But Prosper, Leo's secretary, and the acts of the council, only take notice of the opposition that was made by Hilarius, and of him they speak with the greatest commendations, without ever mentioning the bishop Julius.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 188, 189.      <sup>2</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 255.

(\*) The fathers of Ephesus only forbid any symbol to be publicly made use of, besides that of Nice. But their decree Dioscorus interpreted, as if they had forbidden any article to be defined, that was not in express terms contained in that symbol.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 305.

(†) Bellarmine, Davidius, and Lupus, make Ion descendants on this appeal, pretending it was to Leo Flavianus appealed. But Leo himself supposes him to have appealed to an oecumenical council, since it was upon his appeal, that he pressed the emperor to assemble one; (a) which he would never have done, had Flavianus appealed to him alone.

(a) Leo, ep. 39, 40.

<sup>4</sup> Concil. p. 39. 46. Theodoret. ep. 116.

<sup>5</sup> Prosp. chron.



The other bishops intercede for Flavianus. The soldiers, monks, and rabble, break into the council. The terror and consternation of the bishops. Dioscorus obliges all the bishops to sign a blank paper. The pope's legates refuse to sign it. Some of the bishops inhumanly beaten. The blank paper, how filled up by Dioscorus. Flavianus treated with great barbarity. Is sent into exile, but dies on the road. Is honored as a saint.

The other friends of Flavianus, well apprised of the injustice of the sentence, and unwilling to confirm it with their suffrages, but apprehending, at the same time, the dreadful consequences of their opposing or any ways disobliging Dioscorus, rose from their seats, and, prostrating themselves before him, begged, in the most submissive terms, that he would consider what he was doing, and not proceed to such extremities, which they could not approve without betraying their consciences, and rendering themselves unworthy of the rank they held in the church. But the only answer he returned to their prayers and entreaties was, that were his tongue to be cut out, he would not order a single syllable to be altered in the sentence they had heard. As the bishops, not satisfied with this answer, continued, in the same humble posture, to intercede for Flavianus, Dioscorus, losing all patience, started up unexpectedly from his throne, and with a stern look and angry voice, "What!" said he, "do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?" meaning Elpidius and Eulogius, the imperial commissioners. The counts, who were both present, upon hearing themselves called, immediately ordered the doors of the church to be set open; which was no sooner done, than the proconsul of Asia entered, surrounded with a band of soldiers, and followed by a confused multitude of the rabble and monks, some of them with chains in their hands, and others with clubs and stones, the usual arms of that militia. It is impossible to express the terror and confusion which their appearance occasioned in the assembly: some of the bishops took refuge behind the throne of Dioscorus, while others either crept under the benches, on which they were sitting, or strove to conceal themselves, the best they could, in the most retired places of the church; for the doors were all well guarded, and no bishop was allowed to go out. In the midst of this confusion, Dioscorus, raising his voice, cried out, with an imperious tone, "The sentence must be signed; if any one objects to it, let him take care, for it is with me he has to deal." At these words, the bishops, trembling and pale with fear, resumed their places; when Dioscorus, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem, attended by an armed multitude, carried about a blank paper, and presenting it to each bishop, obliged all to sign it. Juvenalis signed it the first, Domnus of Antioch signed after him, and the rest after Domnus, in the order they sat, except the Egyptians, who were not required to sign till all the rest had, that they might have something to plead, in case, upon a change of affairs, they should be obliged to give an account of their conduct; and it was upon this consideration that Dioscorus himself chose to sign the last of all.<sup>1</sup> The defection was

general; for out of one hundred and forty-nine bishops, and their deputies, not one was found, besides the pope's legates, who had the courage to withstand the menaces of Dioscorus and his satellites. They indeed stood up to the last in defence of Flavianus; nor could they by any menaces be prevailed upon to follow the example of the rest, declaring, with great intrepidity, when threatened by Dioscorus, that they had rather suffer a thousand deaths, than it should ever be said that he had been countenanced in his wickedness by the representatives of the apostolic see.<sup>1</sup> Dioscorus however spared them; but some other bishops, who, animated by them, refused at first to sign the above-mentioned paper, he caused to be inhumanly beaten; and one among the rest, for only pointing at the soldiers, while he was upon the point of signing, to declare, that he did not do it freely, but merely out of fear. The treatment these met with so awed the rest, that they all signed, without betraying the least reluctance or scruple;<sup>2</sup> and then the paper, to which they had all set their names, was filled up by Dioscorus with the charge of heresy against Flavianus for acknowledging two natures in Christ, and with the sentence of his deposition for presuming to condemn Eutyches, in defiance of an express canon of the council of Ephesus, because he acknowledged but one; which was there declared the true catholic and orthodox doctrine. Flavianus, in hearing the sentence read, excepted anew against Dioscorus; which so provoked that haughty prelate, that he, and others of his party, falling upon him, in a transport of passion, first beat him in a most barbarous manner, as it were in emulation of one another, and then, throwing him on the ground, trampled upon him till he was ready to expire; when Dioscorus, not thinking he had yet his full revenge, ordered him to be carried, in that condition, to prison, and the next morning, when he was scarce able to stir, into exile. The soldiers appointed to attend him, dragged him as far as Epipus in Lydia, two days journey from Ephesus, where he died of the bruises he had received in the council, three days before, and the fatigues he had been forced to undergo in his journey.<sup>3</sup> He is now honored as a saint, by the church of Rome; and his festival is kept, with great solemnity, on the 24th of November, at Recanati, between Loreto and Macerata, and Giulia-nuova in Abruzzo, the former city pretending to have one of his arms, and the latter the rest of his body. Upon the death of Theodosius, the emperor Marcian, his successor, caused the body of Flavianus to be translated from Epipus to Constantinople, and to be deposited there in the church of the apostles:<sup>4</sup> but of a

<sup>1</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 113. Liberat. c. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 939.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 403. Liberat. c. 12. Prosp. chron.,

<sup>4</sup> Leo. ep. 59.



Hilarius, the pope's legate, escapes from Ephesus. Many of the orientals deposed, with their patriarch, and sent into exile. The council dissolved. This council never received in the west. The deposition of Flavianus confirmed by the emperor. All condemned who held the same doctrine, and likewise their books and writings. Leo assembles a council in the west. Writes to the emperor for the assembling of an oecumenical council. Writes to the empress Pulcheria, and several others.

second translation no mention is made by any credible writer.

Hilarius, the pope's legate, terrified at the treatment Flavianus met with in the council, withdrew unexpectedly from Ephesus, before the death of that prelate, and, travelling only in the night, and through by-roads, got safe out of the reach of Dioscorus, who, as he suspected, was determined to treat him no better than he had done Flavianus, if he could by no other means prevail upon him to consent to his condemnation.<sup>1</sup> With Flavianus were condemned, deposed, and sent into exile, the greater part of the orientals, and Domnus, their patriarch, though both he and his suffragans had, through fear of forfeiting their sees, signed the condemnation of Flavianus, anathematized the doctrine of two natures, and consented to every thing else that Dioscorus had required of them. The crime laid to their charge was, their having formerly opposed Cyril, and lately Eutyches, whose doctrine, it was pretended, they could not condemn as heterodox, without approving and admitting that of Nestorius, as catholic and orthodox. The day after the deposition of the orientals, Dioscorus unexpectedly left Ephesus, and by his departure dissolved the council.

This council, though oecumenical, and lawfully assembled, was never received, as the reader may well imagine, by Leo and the other bishops in the west; nay, they would not even allow it to be styled a council, but stigmatized it with the name of "Latrocinium Ephesinum," the name by which it is generally known, on account of the violence, peculiar to robbers, that was used there by Dioscorus, and those of his party. Facundus, bishop of Hermiana in Africa, who flourished in the time of Justinian, alleges this council, and that of Rimini, to show, that there is no depending on the definitions of councils, when the bishops, who compose them, are not free, but awed either by princes, or their own brethren.<sup>2</sup> There are but very few, if any, oecumenical councils, whose definitions can, by this rule, be depended on. The definitions of this council were soon after declared null by that of Chalcedon; and Leo did all that lay in his power to procure an edict from the emperor Marcian, forbidding it even to be mentioned, lest posterity should know, that such a judgement had ever been given, that such an assembly, or conventicle, as he styles it, had ever been held.<sup>3</sup> However, Dioscorus and Eutyches had interest enough at court to obtain an edict of the emperor Theodosius, not only confirming the condemnation and deposition of Flavianus, and the other bishops, but commanding all,

who professed the same doctrine, which he there supposes to be the doctrine of Nestorius, to be treated in the same manner. By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any, who taught, held, or favored the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them, or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burned.<sup>1</sup> The good emperor was utterly unacquainted with the circumstances attending the deposition of Flavianus; nay, the friends of Eutyches and Dioscorus at court, especially the favorite eunuch Chrysaphius, concealed from him, with so much care, every circumstance that could any ways prejudice him against the council, that in the height of the disturbances, and universal confusion, which reigned all over the east, and had been occasioned by the condemnation of Flavianus, he wrote to the emperor Valentinian, that, by the deposition of so turbulent a prelate, peace had, in the end, been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions.<sup>2</sup>

In the mean time Leo, being informed by his legate Hilarius, who had escaped from Ephesus, of what had passed there before his departure, assembled, without delay, a council at Rome, consisting of almost all the western bishops; and, with their advice, wrote to Theodosius, in his own and their name, complaining of the violence that had been committed at Ephesus, and entreating him, in the name of the Holy Trinity, to declare null what had been done there, and leave all things in the condition they were in before the council of Constantinople, till a greater number of bishops should assemble from all parts of the world, to give their opinion concerning a point, in which they were all equally concerned. He begs, that they may be allowed to assemble in Italy, since his legates had protested against the decisions of the council of Ephesus, and to them Flavianus had delivered his appeal. As he was not a subject of Theodosius, but Valentinian, over whom he had a great ascendant, he speaks, throughout his whole letter, with great freedom, of the council of Ephesus, though approved by Theodosius; and even warns that prince to be more upon his guard against those, whose interest it was to deceive him, because the sins that were committed by men acting with his authority, would, on the last day, be imputed to him.<sup>3</sup> Not satisfied with writing to the emperor, he wrote at the same time to the empress Pulcheria his sister; to the clergy, nobility, and people of Constantinople; to the

<sup>1</sup> Liberat. c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Facund. l. 12. c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Concil. t. 4. 674.

<sup>1</sup> Concil. ibid. p. 864. Theodoret. ep. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Theodoret. ep. ad Joan. Germaniciæ Epis. p. 702.

<sup>3</sup> Leo ep. 40.



The emperor Valentinian at Rome. Leo applies to him for the assembling of an oecumenical council. In his grief, not forgetful of the dignity of his see. The emperor and the empresses write to Theodosius, and entreat him to assemble an oecumenical council, but in vain.

abbots of that city; to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, and to Julianus, bishop of the island of Cos.<sup>1</sup> In all these letters he encourages, exhorts, entreats those, to whom they were addressed, to continue in the communion of Flavianus, for he had not yet heard of his death, to adhere steadfastly to the ancient faith, in defiance of all the powers combined against it, and to join him in defending the truth, and combating, even at the expense of their lives, the opposite errors. In his letter to Pulcheria, who was greatly addicted to the see of Rome, and has therefore been sainted, he entreats her to employ all her interest with the emperor to obtain the assembling of an oecumenical council, and all her authority to prevent the evils that would be otherwise occasioned by the war, which had been lately declared against the faith of the church, vesting her for that purpose with the legation of St. Peter. The deacon Hilarius wrote likewise to the empress Pulcheria, and in his letter had the vanity to brag, as if the vigorous resolutions taken by Leo were chiefly owing to him.

Not long after Leo had written these letters, the emperor Valentinian, with his mother Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius, came from Ravenna, the usual place of their residence, to visit the churches of the saints in Rome, according to a superstitious custom which began to obtain about this time. They arrived in that city on the eve of the chair of St. Peter, a festival, which was then kept, as it is to this day, with great solemnity, on the 21st of February. The very next morning they went to perform their devotions in the church of that apostle; and, in entering it, were received by Leo, attended by a great number of bishops, whom he had assembled from the different provinces of Italy, to make, on that occasion, a more grand and awful appearance. He no sooner came into the presence of the imperial family, than he burst into tears; and when he began to speak, his words were so interrupted with sighs, as not to be understood by any that heard him. Having thus, like a skilful orator, disposed the emperor to hearken to him with attention, and entirely gained the two empresses, who are said to have mixed their tears with his, though they could not yet know why he shed them, he restrained for a while the excess of his grief, and addressing the emperor with a more intelligible voice, first represented, with his usual eloquence, the great danger the church was in, and the calamities she had reason to apprehend from the violences committed at Ephesus, and the deposition of the holy bishop Flavianus. Then resuming his sighs and tears, he conjured the emperor and the empresses, by the apostle to whom they were going to pay their respects, by their own salvation, and the sal-

vation of Theodosius, to write to that prince, and spare no pains, since the true faith and religion were at stake, to persuade him to declare null, whatever had been done by the unhappy council of Ephesus, to restore Flavianus, whom he still believed alive, to his former dignity, and refer the whole affair to the judgment of the apostolic see. A modest demand indeed! But he immediately added, that bishops being allowed to assemble in Italy from all parts of the world, he (the pope) might hear them, and together with them, impartially examine every step that had been hitherto taken by either party. His grief did not make him forget his own dignity, or that of his see. For in the close of his speech he put the emperor in mind of the eminent rank he held in the church; of his being raised above all other bishops; and its being, on that consideration, incumbent upon him, as Flavianus had appealed, to apply for the assembling of a council.<sup>1</sup> In compliance with his request, Valentinian, as well as the two empresses, wrote to Theodosius before they left Rome, entreating him, by all that was holy, to agree on the assembling of an oecumenical council in Italy, as the only means of healing the divisions, which the violent and irregular proceedings of the council of Ephesus had already occasioned in the east, and would soon produce in the west, the bishop of Rome, and the other western bishops, being determined never to acquiesce in the decisions of that assembly; so that a general schism would ensue, and an entire separation between the east and the west, unless an oecumenical council were quickly assembled. In all these letters long descants are made on the dignity and pre-eminence of the Roman see; which has induced some to think that they were dictated by Leo himself. And indeed the sentiments are his; for he insinuates them in several of his letters; but the style comes far short of the propriety and elegance so remarkable in the writings which all agree to be his. To these letters Theodosius returned no other answer, than that he had done already all that could be done, to procure and maintain the peace and unity of the church, which he had as much at heart as they; that Flavianus, the author and fire-brand of the late disturbances, having been deposed, the so much wished for calm and tranquillity had, by that means, been restored to all the churches in his dominions; and therefore as there could be no occasion for the assembling of any more councils, he begged they would lay aside all thoughts of that kind.<sup>2</sup>

In the mean time several bishops, who had been assisting to Dioscorus in the violences committed at Ephesus, being informed of the measures that Leo was pursuing to procure

<sup>1</sup> Leo. ep. 41. 43, 44, 45. 47.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. t. 4. p. 52. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. p. 52. Liberat. c. 12.







